

THE FALSE VISIONARIES OF LOURDES

IT was hardly to be expected that the second and third volumes of the late Père Cros' "*Histoire de Notre-Dame de Lourdes d'après les Documents et les Témoins*" could compete in general interest with the first, which gave so full an account of the apparitions to Bernadette. And yet, from the point of view of those who would collect data for a Catholic psychology of religious experience, this second portion of Père Cros' work is quite as important as anything which has gone before, and is even more full of surprises. It is not necessary to accept all Père Cros' own conclusions in order to appreciate the value of the service he has rendered. As I pointed out on a previous occasion,¹ he has ransacked the archives of the prefecture and the episcopal residence at Tarbes, those of the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Cultes in Paris, together with the official papers preserved at Pau and at Lourdes itself, while he has also obtained statements from a large number of eye-witnesses who played a leading part in the events which during the whole of the year 1858, kept the little Pyrenean town in a state of ferment. Many of the documents are printed entire, and it must be owned that the general reader will probably grow rather impatient of so much reiteration and detail. But the facts had, ultimately, to be made known, and, with the text of the official reports before him, no critic in future will be able to say that certain quite astonishing features in the early history of our Lady's shrine have been invented or unduly exaggerated.

When writing previously upon Père Cros' first volume, I called attention to the fact that he had rehabilitated some of those actors in the early scenes who appear so disadvantageously in the pages of Henri Lasserre's "*Notre-Dame de Lourdes*." M. Jacomet, the Commissaire de Police; M. Dutour, the Procureur Impérial; and the Baron Massy, the Préfet des Hautes-Pyrénées, were all undoubtedly energetic in opposing the first manifestations of popular enthusiasm and were agreed in the policy of obstructing access to the

¹ See THE MONTH for August, 1926: "Blessed Bernadette in the Light of Official Documents." Père Cros' work is published by Beauchesne of Paris. The second and third volumes cost respectively 36 and 28 francs.

grotto. But Père Cros makes it clear that they were all sincere and religiously-minded men, and that they had serious ground for regarding the movement in its beginnings as grossly superstitious. It was not only that the Soubirous family were disreputable—Bernadette's father had been imprisoned for theft and her mother was notoriously intemperate—nor, again, that Madame Millet, whose past history had not been free from scandal, was mixed up in the affair; but the more ardent believers in the new manifestation succeeded in putting themselves thoroughly in the wrong. When the series of apparitions had come to an end after the vision of April 7th, the clergy were certainly indiscreet in their championship of the popular feeling. M. l'Abbé Peyramale, the Curé, though he had at first shown no sympathy at all for Bernadette, seems to have suddenly veered round to an attitude of enthusiastic advocacy. Some of her lay supporters, and notably M. Estrade and Dr. Dozous, are now shown upon the incontrovertible evidence of contemporary documents to have been credulous in the extreme and quite unreliable in their published statements. All sorts of extravagant and baseless rumours were believed by the inhabitants of Lourdes and passed on to the peasantry of the surrounding country districts. Stories of miraculous cures were in circulation at an early date, and of some of them we have dramatic first-hand narratives, written down at the time by those who took the keenest interest in what was going on, but as the investigations of the Episcopal Commission subsequently showed, no one of these cures so much talked of at the time could be approved as demonstrably supernatural in origin. One such incident is so typical of what is wont to happen in times of popular religious excitement that it will not be amiss to reproduce a few details from Père Cros' first volume. M. Clarens, said to have been both a devout and an exceptionally intelligent man, writes in his diary, as early as March 4, 1858, that on this day Bernadette had again visited the grotto, had seen the apparition, and that on coming away, when she noticed a poor girl, kneeling close at hand, who was evidently in great affliction, she put her arms around her neck and kissed her. She did not know the girl, M. Clarens says, nor why she acted thus, but it was reported all through Lourdes that the girl, who was blind, had been cured in that same instant. This was the story generally believed, but M. Clarens very prudently adds that such statements could not

be safely accepted without fuller investigation. Other accounts, but little later in date, add more or less fantastic details. Next day the Mayor of Lourdes mentioned the subject in a dispatch to the Préfet at Tarbes. He tells him that the girl came from a village in the neighbourhood, that her name was Troy, that M. Peyramale had interviewed her father, and that the latter had declared upon his word of honour that the facts were correctly reported. The girl had been blind, but she was now able to see so well that she had threaded her way alone and unaided through the crowd in the market-place. M. Peyramale, the Curé, seems to have been entirely convinced, and the letter he wrote to the Bishop of Tarbes in this sense is also preserved.¹ Subsequent inquiry, however, proved that the idea of a miraculous cure was quite unfounded. The girl had never been in any proper sense blind, though there was serious eye-trouble. It was true that Bernadette had embraced her—an act, by the way, which was severely censured by her critics as a theatrical attempt to attract notice—and it seems that the embrace had raised in the poor invalid's heart an eager hope that she was about to be cured. Under this conviction, her appearance changed, her eye grew brighter, and her step was more confident. But the improvement, real or fancied, did not last, and she died not long afterwards. A number of other alleged miracles, attributed to the use of the water of the spring, proved just as illusory. Apparently, M. Peyramale, having sustained something of a reverse in the case of the blind girl just mentioned, was eager to retrieve any loss of credit by discovering other miracles that were better attested. On April 11th he reported to the Bishop two cures which he had personally investigated.² One was that of a boy at Ger, who, though seven years old had never learned to walk; the other, that of a woman, Mme. Touya-Mengelle, who had been bent double by acute spasms in the lumbar region, but who after employing the water of the grotto as a lotion was now walking upright and almost free from pain. Two days later the Curé had another case to report, that of Catherine Gesta, aged 14, who, since she was two years old, had suffered from violent palpitations of the heart which the doctors had been unable to relieve. She had drunk water at the grotto for a fortnight and was now nearly well.³ The Procureur Impérial in an

¹ Cros, "Histoire," Vol. I., pp. 395—398.

² *Ib.* Vol. II., pp. 22—24.

³ *Ib.* Vol. II., p. 26.

official dispatch drafted on April 14th at the express request of the Minister of Justice in Paris, stated that "everywhere the one topic of conversation is the miracles worked day after day by Bernadette and the water of the grotto. People profess to count them by the hundred." For a few of these miracles, those, for example, mentioned above, definite names, circumstances and localities were cited. The Commissaire de Police, M. Jacomet, very rightly made it his business to inquire into these cases. We have his reports, and in reading them the absurdity of appealing to such incidents as proofs of supernatural intervention becomes patent. As already mentioned, the episcopal commissioners appointed before the end of the same year, 1858, to investigate the whole matter of the visions and the cures, rejected all the cases of which the Curé and others had made so much at the beginning. There was no sufficient reason, they held, to regard any of them as miraculous. Père Cros, himself an ardent champion of the divine mission of Bernadette, repeatedly affirms that the attitude of suspicion and repression adopted by the Government officials, from the Ministers in Paris down to the Procureur and Commissaire at Lourdes, was fully justified, owing to the extravagance of enthusiastic believers and the indiscretions of the local clergy.

The ready acceptance of imaginary or unproven miracles was only one amongst many indications of the lack of mental balance conspicuous in the ardent pilgrims to the grotto. Some of these manifestations of popular devotion, it is true, cannot be read of without a feeling of admiration for the simple faith, self-sacrifice, and reliance in their neighbours' honesty, of which these very extravagances gave proof. Bernadette having reported that Our Lady wanted a chapel built beside the Gave, the people were persistent in their efforts to transform the grotto at once into a shrine. They came in vast crowds to pray there. They kissed the ground. They drank of the spring, bathed their eyes, their faces and their injured limbs in the water, carried it off in bottles and munched a few blades of the grass or herbs which grew beside it. As early as March 22nd, a basket had been placed in the grotto to receive offerings. We learn from the reports of the Commissaire and the Procureur that it was common at the end of a day to find that 60 or 70 francs had been deposited in it almost all in halfpence or centimes. On Easter Monday (April 5th) the total reached 100 francs. On April 24th,

when the fair was held in Lourdes, the contributions amounted to 237 francs. Besides this there were offerings in kind, particularly great parcels of home-spun linen, and on one occasion a cheese. Writing on April 29th, Jacomet reports :

The great bulk of these contributions comes from the poorest and most miserable class of the population. Only once has a piece of gold been found in the basket. Would you like to know, M. le Préfet, who the donor was? Well, it was an unfortunate tailor of Tarbes, called Jacques (I don't know his other name), who had been paralysed for twelve years, the father of a number of young children. He managed to get himself brought to Lourdes in a cart and thence was carried down to the grotto in a chair. It was he who was the first to make an offering of a gold piece for ten francs.¹

Meanwhile the grotto itself was being transformed into a kind of chapel. Garlands of flowers were hung up and innumerable pious objects, pictures, statues, ex-votos, etc., were attached to the rock or propped up on ledges. There were candles in profusion burning day and night. The authorities at first waited patiently, thinking that after Bernadette had ceased to visit the scene, the conflux of pilgrims would gradually die down; but this was far from being the case. Not unnaturally, having no better evidence before them than on the one hand, the trances of a child whom the doctors, in their report, declared to be subject to hallucinations, and, on the other, certain reported miracles which upon inquiry had all proved quite illusory, the officials at Lourdes came to the conclusion that the movement was to be regarded as an extravagance of superstitious credulity, which it was desirable to nip in the bud. This, it seemed to them, ought not to be very difficult, in spite of the strong hold which the recent apparition had taken on the popular sympathy. According to French law no chapel could be erected for public worship without the sanction of both the bishop of the diocese and the civil authorities. No such sanction had been given, and the executive were consequently within their right in removing from the spot (which, in any case, was not in private ownership) the chapel furnishings which had been deposited there. On the 4th of May, accordingly, all these decorations and

¹ Cros, "Histoire," Vol. II., p. 75.

objects of piety were brought to the Mairie, where those who had originally left them at the grotto were free to reclaim them if they so wished.

Much popular excitement was occasioned at Lourdes by this step, and all sorts of wild rumours obtained credence, more particularly regarding the chastisements which were supposed to have befallen those who had taken any part in denuding the shrine. More serious in its consequences was the story which circulated towards the end of May that the Emperor Napoleon III. had given orders that all the pious objects were to be restored to the grotto, a story which was further embellished with the detail that the Emperor had written to Bernadette herself, asking her prayers and enclosing a sum of 600 francs. The credence given to this fiction brought larger crowds than ever to the rocks of Massabielle and after a prodigious exchange of dispatches with headquarters the officers of the law took action against three pious gossips of Lourdes upon the charge of disseminating false intelligence. A very slight penalty was inflicted in the court of first instance, but on appeal to a higher tribunal at Pau the three accused on July 15th were eventually acquitted. In the meantime strong barriers had been erected to exclude visitors from all entrance to the grotto, and a notice board informed the public that those who made their way down to the river-bank in front of the Massabielle rocks would be prosecuted as trespassers. To a considerable extent the decree was evaded or set at naught, the keepers themselves (*gardes champêtres*) being in thorough sympathy with the populace. On three occasions the whole palisade was demolished during the night and thrown into the river, and it is amusing now to learn through Père Cros' researches that the man, a skilful carpenter, who had played the leading part in tearing down the structure in the night time was engaged by the Mayor a few days afterwards to help in building it up again. But so long as any unpleasant consequences were to be apprehended, the secret was faithfully kept and the police never discovered the perpetrators of these outrages. As is well known, the eventual restoration of free access to the grotto was mainly due to the difficulty created by the appearance on the spot on the same day of two distinguished pilgrims from Paris—one of them the editor of the "Univers," M. Louis Veuillot, the other the widow of Admiral Bruat, who was then the *gouvernante* of the little Prince Imperial. Callet,

the garde, had instructions to call the attention of visitors to the fact that it was not permitted to approach the grotto or the river bank in front of it, but the visitors, disregarding his protests, made their way down to pray at the barrier and to drink of the spring. A *procès-verbal* was drawn up in both cases,¹ but the Préfet, after asking instructions from Paris, decided that it would not do to carry the matter into court. As quite a number of other people at about the same time were being prosecuted and fined for precisely the same offence, the position of the authorities eventually became untenable. But it was not until October 5th that the revocation of the prohibitory bye-law of June 8th was formally announced with the usual preliminary roll of the drum by the town-crier of Lourdes.

I have not, however, yet touched upon that feature in the early history of Our Lady's shrine which reveals most clearly the extravagance which was associated with the piety of the first believers, and which also formed the soundest justification for the attitude of such genuinely Catholic officials as MM. Dutour and Jacomet. The matter to which I refer has been very slightly, and indeed very misleadingly, dealt with in those books from which we derive most of our knowledge of Lourdes in the year 1858. M. Estrade, it is true, has spoken more freely in his volume, "*Les Apparitions de Lourdes*," but we cannot help discovering from Père Cros' conscientious researches that M. Estrade has unfortunately shown himself over and over again a most untrustworthy witness. The principal offender, however, is M. Henri Lasserre and it may not be amiss to quote from his pages the few paragraphs which he devotes to the false visionaries of Lourdes. After speaking of Blessed Bernadette's last belated vision of the Blessed Virgin from the right bank of the Gave on July 15th, M. Lasserre goes on :

Of an opposite character in some sense, strange facts occurred which it is important to notice. On three or four occasions there were children and women who

¹ Père Cros has reproduced *literatim* the terms of the entry which the garde champêtre, Callet, in a handwriting as quaint as his spelling, made in his note-book on this occasion. "Le 28 juillet 1858, avoir fait un rapport à M. le Maire et à M. le Commissaire de police, d'avoir trouvé la Dame de la Miral Bruhat, veuve, Gouverneuse des enfants de la France, et sa famille, à compagne d'une seur. Plus, un M. qui était le redatteur de journal universel à compagne de 3 prêtres. Callet." Mme l'Amirale Bruat was accompanied by her three daughters and a nun; M. Louis Veuillot by three priests.

claimed to have had visions like Bernadette. Were these visions genuine? Did diabolic mysticism attempt to graft itself upon the divine mysticism in order to cause trouble? Was there nothing more at the bottom of these singular phenomena than a mind that had lost its balance, or the mischievous pranks of a pack of naughty children? Or must we rather look for some evil influence treacherously hidden from view which thrust these visionaries into prominence in order to throw discredit on the miraculous events of the Grotto? We know not.¹

After this M. Lasserre, I am sorry to say, goes on deliberately to insinuate that this was a development concerted between the Préfet, Baron Massy, and "the crafty and very capable Commissaire de Police," who both of them were determined to bring the apparitions into disrepute. It is true that M. Lasserre does not absolutely affirm that this was so, but he implies that it was only what everybody at Lourdes was saying; and then he goes on:

Whatever be the value of these suspicions, which were very probably unjust, such scenes were calculated to trouble the minds of men. M. le Curé of Lourdes, much distressed at the scandalous gossip, promptly expelled the children concerned from the catechism class and declared that if another such case occurred he would himself see that the matter was sifted to the bottom and that the true instigators were brought to light. The Curé's attitude and threat at once produced a profound impression. The visions stopped on the instant and were not heard of again. They had only lasted four or five days.

M. Lasserre's opportunities of investigating the truth may have been limited and his intentions may no doubt have been excellent, but, materially speaking, the statements of this last paragraph, when read in the light of the materials now supplied in Père Cros' second volume, prove to be quite scandalously in conflict with the facts. So far from the counterfeit visions lasting only four or five days, or being confined to two or three women and a handful of children, or coming to an end when the Curé expelled one of the boys concerned from his catechism class; we find that already even before April 13th there were at least two visionaries who claimed to have seen Our Lady as Bernadette had seen her. We find

¹ Lasserre, "Our Lady of Lourdes," Bk. VII., ch. v.

that new visionaries were continually declaring themselves—Père Cros speaks of as many as thirty or forty who were in evidence at the same date. We find that several of these were as devoutly believed in and encouraged by the clergy as Bernadette herself had been. We find that new claimants came forward as late as September 18th. We find that the girl who was perhaps the most sincere and the most respected of all this band of pseudo-mystics was still, on the feast of the Immaculate Conception in December, seeing the same visions, which had begun in April.

On December 7, 1858, while the great bells in full peal were acclaiming Bernadette's Blessed Lady, Marie Courrech at the grotto heard *her lady* speak to her thus: "Thou must tell thy confessor that there ought to be a procession"; and, the following day, the same lady said to her: "Here I will distribute my favours. I am the Immaculate Conception."

In refutation of the repeated insinuations of M. Lasserre that Jacomet and the Baron Massy were in fact the inventors and instigators of the false visions, it is interesting to point out that one of the very earliest to draw attention, and that without a trace of reprobation, to the new series of apparitions which seemed to be beginning, was M. l'Abbé Peyramale himself. In a letter to the Bishop of Tarbes, dated May 8, 1858, which Père Cros has inspected and copied, he refers to the Marie Courrech just mentioned, in the following terms:

The visions are still going on. Last Thursday the Mayor's housemaid, a saintly girl if ever there was one, is believed to have seen the Blessed Virgin at the grotto. This creates a curious situation for our friend the Mayor, who has received orders to arrest all visionaries. I sent for the girl, who is not a penitent of mine, and I pointed out to her the consequences which such visits may entail for herself and for her master. She promised me that she would not return to the grotto unless I give her permission.*

But this was not the first report of the kind that the Abbé Peyramale had forwarded to his bishop. In a letter of April 11th the Curé wrote:

* Cros, "Histoire," Vol. II., p. 479.

* *Ib.* p. 93. Père Cros points out in a footnote that the servant Marie Courrech's visions had already begun on April 17th.

I am enclosing, Monseigneur, with this a rather interesting document. It is the statement made by a Lourdes girl (Marie Cazenave) who seems also to have seen the Apparition. I should like to say that the girl offers every guarantee of good faith. She wanted to enter the Daughters of the Cross, and she would have been a religious before this if her family had been willing to give their consent.¹

It is to be noted that both Jacomet and M. Dutour bear out the good character here given to Marie Cazenave. The Commissaire, on April 19th, sending in a full report to the Préfet at Tarbes, described in some detail the surroundings of the grotto and especially the sort of upper chamber in the opening of which Our Lady had appeared to Bernadette. At this date, of course, everybody was still free to come and pray there, a rude substitute for an altar had been set up, and the spot was decorated with flowers and pious offerings.

It was on Saturday, the 10th [writes Jacomet], that a number of women made bold to explore the niche for the first time. They were deterred neither by the fact that they had to scramble over the altar, nor by any sense of propriety. There were five of them, a very ill-assorted band, both as regards age, habits and morals.

One was Claire-Marie Cazenave, twenty-two, a good girl (*filie vertueuse*), full of faith, but imaginative and *exaltée*. "I saw," she reported, "a white rock and almost at the same moment the form of a woman of medium height, carrying a child on her left arm. Her face was smiling, her hair flowed down upon her shoulders in ringlets; on her head she had something white, supported by a sort of comb. Her dress also was white. As for the child, I only saw it imperfectly in my first glance, and I did not notice it afterwards."

Of the other four visitors two were not identified; they apparently did not belong to Lourdes. But Madeleine Cazaux, a married woman, 45 years of age and of intemperate habits, said she saw against the white rock the figure of a young girl, which disappeared whenever the lighted candle they brought with them was moved from its place. Finally, the last of the band, Honorine Lacroix, a woman of over 40, whom Jacomet declared to be no better than a common prosti-

¹ Cros, "Histoire," p. 23.

tute, professed to have been the first to distinguish the Blessed Virgin. She was no bigger, she said, than a child of four years old. "Her eyes were blue and she had flaxen hair."¹

These were the early stages of the epidemic of visions which now broke out, and apart from the character of some of the *voyantes* there was nothing to create any particular scandal. But before long even the most respected amongst them began to develop extravagances. Jacomet, in a report sent to the Préfet on June 22nd, had to announce that the visionaries, prevented from approaching the grotto, had now taken up their station opposite, on the other bank of the river.

Sunday evening [he writes] it was the turn of the Mayor's housemaid (Marie Courrech), who was there amid a crowd of a hundred companions, many of them belonging to the Children of Mary. She had spells of ecstasy and physical contortions, which attracted everybody's attention. This was the sole subject of conversation all the rest of the evening.

Yesterday evening (Monday) Marie Cazenave, a soda-list, at the same spot on the right bank, opposite the grotto, also experienced these ecstatic twitches and contortions, exciting the notice of more than a hundred people who gathered round her.²

It must by no means be supposed that our knowledge of these occurrences is derived only, or even mainly, from the reports of officials who were possibly hostile and prejudiced. Père Cros says distinctly that when he first began, with the fullest episcopal encouragement, to collect materials for his History, he was quite disposed to believe in the genuineness of the visions of Marie Courrech and some few others,³ regarding them as supplementary to the communications made through Bernadette. Accordingly he took down a long deposition from the lips of Marie Courrech herself, which may be read in his book (pp. 96-99). Here we find her echoing with very slight modifications Bernadette's descriptions of the apparition and hearing from Our Lady's lips exactly the same speeches which Bernadette had previously heard. But Père Cros now ascertained from other sources that many extravagant features characterized, at least at times, the behaviour of the Mayor's

¹ *Ib.* pp. 51-52.

² *Ib.* p. 214.

³ *Ib.* pp. 95-96.

housemaid during her apparent ecstasies. No one seems ever to have suggested that she was fraudulently playing a part, but though for a long time many of the clergy believed in her visions that conviction has not endured. As a specimen of several accounts which were furnished him by eye-witnesses of unexceptionable character, Père Cros prints the following statement of Antoinette Garros.

I could never have faith in the visions of Marie Courrech. She did not look like Bernadette or kneel as Bernadette knelt. She was apt to quiver all over and give sudden starts (*soubresauts*). Several times when she was seeing the apparitions from the further side of the Gave she threw herself forward, because, as she explained afterwards, the Apparition was calling her to the grotto. If we had not held her back with all our strength, she would have plunged into the river. One day when I was thus restraining her by force, the people who were looking on began to call out: "But why not let her go? If she crosses the Gave, we shall have a miracle." But I paid no attention; I preferred to prevent her drowning herself, and I said to myself: "If Our Lady wants her on the other side, she will certainly be able to release her from my arms."

If these extravagances were observable in good and self-respecting young women who bore a high reputation for piety, it is not surprising that the most preposterous antics were performed by those of indifferent character and by the scores of children of all ages who soon began to see visions in imitation of their elders. The pious townsfolk of Lourdes and the peasants of the surrounding hamlets, now absolutely convinced of the genuineness of the first apparitions at the grotto, were prepared to treat even the youngest of their offspring as channels of divine inspiration. A boy of ten would marshal a whole procession of adults, would tell them to kneel down and to stand up at a given signal, to hold out their rosaries towards the figure of Our Lady which he claimed to see, nay more to surrender these rosaries or other objects of piety (sometimes of a certain intrinsic value) because Our Lady wanted them. And it not infrequently happened that the little corypheus of such a scene having acquired possession of

* *Ib.* p. 99. There is much confirmatory evidence in the case of other visionaries. See p. 100.

all these objects would cast them down into some cavity in the grotto, or throw them into the river, whence their owners never recovered them. There seems no doubt that these children often did pass into a state of trance, and that some of them at least had real hallucinations. Such, for example, was Laurent Lacaze, of Ossen, aged 10, who saw not only the Blessed Mary, the Holy Mother, but a little man clothed in white whom Mary called *lou boun Diu ou autément Jean* (the good God or otherwise John) and with them Joseph and Peter. They led the way back to Ossen, *lou boun Diu* going in front, then Mary between Peter and Joseph, followed by Laurent, who carefully arranged the rest of the procession.¹ Of the adult visionaries, apart from those already mentioned, nearly all seemed to have exhibited strange and repellent phenomena, hysterical convulsions, grimaces, contortions, etc; while, of course, in many cases, there was the gravest reason to suspect deliberate imposture. Whatever M. Lasserre may say, it is overwhelmingly plain from the documents which Père Cros cites, not only that these pitiable delusions were a subject of excitement at Lourdes for several months together, but also that they brought scandal upon religion in the eyes of all intelligent Catholics who were able to take an impartial view of the situation. That such an epidemic of visions and hysterical extravagances is possible has been only too often proved in the history of the last half century. Let it be sufficient to refer here to the scenes which took place at Tilly-sur-Seulles, in Calvados, during the years 1896-1899.² The outbreak at Lourdes was precisely similar in character, and I believe that all unprejudiced Catholic readers of Père Cros' "*Histoire de Notre-Dame de Lourdes*" will agree with him that the Government, under the circumstances, were thoroughly justified in forbidding access to the grotto, and that the incident in the Providence of God has only served to ensure the triumph of a true Divine communication over a mass of hysterical counterfeits.

HERBERT THURSTON.

¹ See Cros, *Histoire*, II., 228—239 and 249—254. A very much longer account of these and other similar extravagances might be given if space permitted. Some of the phenomena seem to have been distinctly supernatural. Among the witnesses whose formal depositions are cited by Cros are priests and highly respected Catholic layfolk.

² I have given some account of these in *THE MONTH* for December, 1920, pp. 537—539.

A MODERNIST ON THE FALL

DR. N. P. WILLIAMS, the Bampton Lecturer for 1924, has published, in expanded form, the discourses delivered at St. Mary's, Oxford, on that Foundation. The title of the book—"The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin: A Historical and Critical Study" (Longmans, 1927)—conveys a somewhat inadequate idea of its contents. From the outset, Dr. Williams has before his mind a larger question—the whole problem of Evil; which he discusses not merely historically and critically, but speculatively. He refuses to isolate the question of moral evil or sin, from that of æsthetic evil (ugliness), and physical evil (pain). If he has succeeded in his task, he will have given the world not merely a new theological synthesis, but an original piece of metaphysical construction as well. Indeed, we imagine he is himself more interested in the speculative than in the merely historical and critical part of his work. The eighth lecture on "The Ultimate Fall" is no mere epilogue, but is intended to be the crown and culmination of the whole work. It is well that this should be recognized. I am not sure that the author himself realizes to what extent the arguments from Scripture and Tradition, to which he devotes so much space, have really been subordinated to and controlled by his philosophical system.

Any contemporary theological work of living interest—and Dr. Williams' book is certainly such—can best be considered in relation to two questions, the synthesis of science and theology, and the problem of the Unity of Christendom. The various Protestant bodies, or at least a large number of their leaders, are beginning to feel, as never before, the evil and disgrace of separatism. As they see the problem it involves a threefold task. (1) To understand their own and one another's actual doctrinal position, and if possible to arrive at a common understanding. (2) To relate this common understanding, when attained, with the historic traditions of Christianity; in other words, to discover, or recover, continuity with the past. (3) To assimilate and integrate with this total result, whatever is of permanent value in modern science and civilization.

Of these problems, Dr. Williams is mainly concerned with the third. His professed aim is to extract from the theologi-

cal literature of all the ages and of all the sects, a minimum of necessary dogma which may be presented to the educated man of the twentieth century with a reasonable hope of its acceptance. The tone of thought is Modernistic: the handling both of Tradition and Scripture is exceedingly Liberal. At the same time, the author professes, and, no doubt, wishes to display, a real regard for tradition as at least a secondary and subordinate criterion of truth. His Modernism proceeds from the desire to make generous concessions to the objections of the learned; his traditionalism from the desire to have the backing of "the Great Church," past and present, for his statements.

Dr. Williams' position is as follows. He admits, in a sense of his own, the doctrine of the Fall. Neither man, nor the creatures below him, are in the condition in which they came from the hands of an omnipotent and infinitely good Creator. The only explanation of their actual condition must be sought in the rebellion of some finite will, which has been mysteriously permitted to vitiate to an indefinite extent the work of the Creator in the material universe. Man, being in part a material being, has his share in this infection. He is the victim, but in no sense the originator, of evil. The true origin of evil is to be sought in what the author calls the Life-force or World-Soul, of which individual beings are but particular manifestations. This Life-force is, nevertheless, to be conceived of as personal (in opposition to Schopenhauer and M. Bergson, to whom Dr. Williams expresses indebtedness for his main conception). We are further informed that Redemption is a continuous, cosmic process, mediated through Christ, whereby in the fullness of time, all individual spirits, and all other forms of created being, and the World-Soul itself, shall be restored and reconciled.

Such is Dr. Williams' metaphysical scheme, the Platonic myth with which his work closes; and we do not intend to delay over an examination of it. It is, of course, a form of Pantheism, or, more accurately, of Pan-Satanism. The author expressly states that men, and all other conscious beings, are substantially identified with this rebellious Will. It is somewhat late in the day to have to insist that Monism does not blend with the Catholic Faith. Dr. Williams does not seem to have adverted to the revolting consequences of his doctrine as applied to the Sacred Humanity of our Lord: for, manifestly, if all finite life is vitiated by substantial iden-

tity with, and emanation from, the Evil One, the human nature which the Son of God assumed must have shared in the same taint. The Redeemer Himself would have needed redemption. From such a conclusion we are sure that Dr. Williams would shrink with as much horror as we do. Yet it is the inevitable outcome of his principles. Only by recourse to a Docetic theory of the Incarnation—making the Sacred Humanity a mere appearance or phantom—could any escape from this conclusion be imagined; and Dr. Williams, we need hardly say, is far from contemplating any such evasion.

It is surely amazing that a speculation so utterly inconsistent with the central doctrine of the Catholic Faith should have been put forward in a Christian pulpit as a restatement of Catholic tradition.

Dr. Williams can hardly expect to gain many converts to his metaphysical doctrines. We imagine that those who feel themselves drawn towards a monistic philosophy will prefer such formulations of the doctrine as are to be found in the philosophers, ancient and modern, whom he himself quotes, where they will find it in a purer and more consistent form than in Dr. Williams' pages.

Such, then, is Dr. Williams' theory of the origin of evil in general. As regards the specific problem of original sin, his doctrine is practically that of the Pelagians. He rejects entirely the conception of transmitted or hereditary guilt, as both self-contradictory and immoral. As the Pelagians said, Adam's sin injured only himself. It has not been in any real sense transmitted to his descendants. At most, there may have resulted from it a certain infirmity of will, and a disturbance of psychological equilibriums, which we undoubtedly experience in ourselves. The whole discussion is complicated and confused by the fact that the author apparently ascribes no degree of historical truth to the narrative of Genesis iii. As regards human origins, he is a convinced and somewhat naïve Darwinist. On such a view, the first man must have been, ethically, a very rudimentary creature, altogether incapable of any momentous decision. The first transgression, accordingly, must have been a trifling affair. It is absurd to suppose that the woes of all humanity should have sprung from such a source. It has to be remembered that, on Dr. Williams' theory (which is that of the whole Modernist school), there is no question of an objective divine revelation

of the fall of man and of original sin. These doctrines are simply the outcome of human thought, applied to the great problems of life. The universal prevalence of sin is one such problem. Whence arises the tendency to evil? Is it natural and essential to man, or is it an acquired character, the outcome of some event in the remote history of the race? Different answers have been given by different philosophies and religions to these questions. The Jewish answer is only one of many, and has no specially divine sanction attaching to it. The story of Eden is only an allegory or myth in which the conception of man's fall has been graphically represented. It was not the only story which Jewish imagination applied to this purpose; but it finally prevailed as on the whole the most adequate vehicle for the doctrine in question. It passed into the New Testament mainly through St. Paul (Rom. v. and I. Cor.); but even its adoption by an inspired writer does not appear to give it any fresh value in Dr. Williams' eyes. St. Paul, he suggests, is not a safe witness in this case to the general mind either of the synagogue or of the Apostolic Church. Being a forceful personality, he would be inclined to impose his own views on those to whom he was writing, and to assume their assent to propositions which they probably would not, if left to themselves, have accepted. The assumption verified itself in the event, and the Church accepted St. Paul's version of the first sin and its fatal consequences.

We have often had occasion, in reading this book, to marvel at the strange combination of ingenuity and obtuseness—there is no other word for it—displayed by the writer: ingenuity in devising expedients for getting rid of awkward facts, obtuseness in failing to perceive the logical consequence of these expedients. In the passage before us, St. Paul is represented as having, by mere force of his assertiveness, fixed upon the Church a doctrine which had no real roots in any divine tradition. Three centuries later, St. Augustine another forceful personality, succeeded by the same means, in imposing upon the Western Church, an altogether untraditional and unauthentic interpretation of St. Paul's teaching. Finally the Western theologians, disciples of Augustine, managed, in the same way, to get this interpretation accepted by the body of the faithful as the only genuine Catholic doctrine. Meanwhile, the Oriental Church (if we are to believe Dr. Williams) had never really accepted the doctrine in question. Thus,

according to our author, is Catholic tradition manufactured, by forceful personalities, and arrogant schools, and ambitious hierarchies. Why we should be called upon to scrutinize the teachings, and defer to the decisions of a tradition of this kind, is a question which the reader is left to solve for himself.

The issue is really quite simple: Is the doctrine of hereditary guilt really a part of Catholic tradition or no? Dr. Williams, *contra mundum*, says, No. In order to arrive at this negative, he is forced to suppose that when Doctors of the Church and Synods of Bishops claimed to be expounding the teaching of Catholic Christendom, they were either ill-informed concerning that teaching or incapable of expressing it except in terms of their own subjectivity. St. Augustine, for instance, was a penitent, full to excess of the conviction of sin. That fact determined his presentation of the fall-doctrine: he was either unaware or was unwilling to acknowledge that quite a different presentation could be given, and had been given by orthodox writers of a different mentality from his own. There is really, says Dr. Williams, a doctrinal cleavage in Catholic tradition, an antagonism of temper and outlook, between the pre-Augustinian Church as a whole, and the subsequent ages, and between the Oriental Churches and the Latin Church. The pre-Augustinians and the Orientals hold mainly what he calls the Hellenic view of human nature, a view which insists but little on the doctrine of sin. They represent what the author, following Professor James, calls the "once born" type of Christian experience and teaching. They had little or no consciousness of any radical evil in human nature, and consequently were little concerned with the doctrine of regeneration or the second birth. The Western writers, on the other hand, and especially those of the African school, were preoccupied almost from the first, with the doctrine of sin and the remission of sin. In them, the relation between nature and grace tends to be one of complete and irreconcilable antagonism. The writers of this school, accordingly, exhibit the "twice-born" type of orthodox mentality, and through St. Augustine, the greatest of them, this school became for more than a thousand years the mould and the standard of Catholic orthodoxy. There were dissidents always, and there has been a gradual moving away from Augustinian teaching everywhere during these latter centuries; and the time is ripe, Dr. Williams believes, for an even more explicit repudiation of its fundamental tenet.

What is this fundamental tenet? Dr. Williams makes it quite clear what he means: it is the very doctrine of original sin itself, in the sense which it has always borne in the minds of believers, namely the doctrine of transmitted, hereditary guilt. Nothing could well be more energetic than the language in which Dr. Williams anathematizes this doctrine.

If Augustine's doctrines of the Fall and of original sin, with their mythological conception of the physical, moral and mental stature of the first man, with their logically incoherent notion of original guilt, their fanatical denial of the possibility of virtue outside the Church, and their horrible corollary of the necessary damnation of unbaptized infants—were really the ecclesiastical doctrine; that is, the doctrine of the Church, as both friends and opponents have hitherto, at least in Western Europe, assumed it to be: if the whole fabric of orthodox dogma were really based upon this one-sided theory of human nature, seamed as it is with so large a vein of mythology and split by a colossal self-contradiction, we should be obliged to conclude that the prospects of defending historical Christianity to the coming generations were of a singularly unpromising kind (p. 383).

In these words many so-called Augustinian positions are assailed, but the central attack is levelled against the "logically incoherent notion" and the "colossal self-contradiction" of the conception of original guilt. We readily concede that later theologians have modified somewhat the rigours of St. Augustine's teaching. Especially has this been the case with reference to the *limbus infantium*. We shrink from employing the word damnation (it has somehow a much more wicked sound in English than in Latin) in connection with unbaptized children. Nevertheless, we may say in passing, the word might still be applied to their case in a strict theological sense, as signifying the penal deprivation of supernatural beatitude. They suffer this deprivation, and they suffer it as a penalty, not for any personal individual fault, but for the corporate, racial offence of all the human tribe. A mysterious, incomprehensible conception, certainly, which language scarcely suffices to express, and which theological analysis will never completely "rationalize"; but not therefore to be accounted, as Dr. Williams would have it, irrational. The point which he misses throughout is pre-

cisely the mysterious character of *all* sin in the Catholic conception; and he misses this point because he refuses to consider sin in reference to God. It is quite clear from the last chapter but one of the book ("Original Sin Reinterpreted") that for Dr. Williams sin is primarily an internal disorder of nature, and a trespass on the rights of others. God comes in, if at all, only in a secondary reference. The offence to God is a consequence of some damage or hurt inflicted upon created nature. In Catholic Theology, all this is reversed. The Catholic holds that the offence to God is the essential and primary malice of sin, whereof the derangement and suffering of nature is but the material manifestation. Sin is essentially an act of rebellion against God. Finite things and persons are but the instruments and occasions of that rebellion. Wrongs inflicted upon them are but a shadow of the wrong attempted against Almighty God. He, as absolute Lord of All, appropriates to Himself all the rights of all creatures by a kind of *altum dominium*; and hence any infringement of those rights is *antecedently* an outrage against Him.

Sin, therefore, puts the sinner into a relation of real hostility to God; and such a relation is nothing merely extrinsic: it is something interiorly degrading, profaning, de-sanctifying the entire personality, soul and mind and body. Enmity with our fellow-creatures induces no such effects. Enmity with God is a state of an opposition to Infinite Holiness: in other words such enmity is in the sinner, a sort of quality or habit or permanent condition of *unholiness*. God and the creature begin to repel each other, so to speak, with all the force of their respective natures. Small wonder that the creature should be affected to the very roots of his being. But, we repeat, it is not in the wounding of the finite nature that the essence of sin, the *formale peccati* consists, but in the relation of hostility and repulsion subsisting between it and God. Sin can only be understood in relation to God.

As the effects of sin are thus deep-going, as they penetrate to the inmost sanctuary of the creature's personality, it is easily credible that not only the sinner, but everything that vitally proceeds from him, should become abominable in the sight of God. How far these disastrous effects might possibly extend, reason does not tell us. All man's works and all his progeny might be, as Cardinal Newman put it, discarded from the Divine Presence. His children might be outlaws

from grace by heredity, before they could be so by their own act. The Catholic Faith tells us that this has occurred in one instance only; in the instance of Adam's sin. That alone has been transmitted to Adam's progeny, that is to all mankind. Hence, St. Augustine rightly applies to the entire race, in its fallen and unredeemed state, abstracting from the personal sin of each and all, the famous phrases *massa damnata*, *massa peccati*, *massa damnationis*, and all the other expressions which Rationalists and Modernists find so revolting. Sin has abounded. The sin of Adam is pre-eminently that "sin of the world" which none but the Lamb of God can take away. We are not proving this doctrine; we are only asserting, what is the indisputable fact, that such is in truth the traditional teaching of the Universal Church.

To tamper with the doctrine of Original Sin is to destroy the doctrine of Redemption. From the first moment of his existence man needs Redemption, not merely to prevent his falling, but as a remedy and a remission for guilt incurred, and to give him the new life, which Adam the author of his natural generation, could not impart. That the denial of this doctrine destroys the theology of the Sacraments will be plain to readers of Dr. Williams' note on Infant Baptism (p. 550).

But is the doctrine ethically tolerable? We contend that it is a mystery, not entirely comprehensible to human reason. From what has been said above, it will be plain that the nature of all sin must be mysterious: for it implies a direct reference to the Infinite. Original sin has the further difficulty that it involves not an individual but a multitude; it involves the propagation of guilt, certainly a most difficult notion. Guilt seems to be something essentially personal and incommunicable. How can we share in the guilt of an action in which we have had no part? Well, we do share to some extent in the being of our parents, we partake of their substance, we are bone of their bone and flesh of their flesh. The doctrine of "seminal identity," or "seminal continuity" is not so forlorn and ill-grounded as Dr. Williams imagines. We are, in a certain true sense, physically one with Adam: he lives in us; we are part of an uninterrupted stream of life, of which he is the headspring. If he bequeaths to us a portion of his being, may he not also bequeath its moral taint? What if the two things, human life and sin, have become, apart from the Redeemer, inseparable?

We have repeatedly urged the mysterious character of this

doctrine; following herein the example of Scripture and the Fathers of the Church. There must be mystery in all the attributes and all the operations of God; in the moral attributes as in all the others. Any Christian theologian who denies this, is cutting the ground from under his own feet. Dr. Williams denies it.

Such a position [he says] lies open to the unanswerable retort by J. S. Mill to a similar appeal to Mystery advanced in this pulpit in the Bampton Lectures of sixty-six years ago: "I will call no being good [or just], who is not what I mean when I apply that epithet to my fellow-creatures; and, if such a being can sentence me to hell for not so calling him, to hell I will go" (p. 382).

Frankly, we are surprised at the impression which this passage seems to have made on our author. Theology is a region in which, as a rule, "unanswerable retorts" count for very little. Mill's argument is little more than a formal declaration of the Will to disbelieve. It renders him immune against Faith. He refuses to predicate any attribute of God, which is not exactly similar to the like-named attributes of creatures. By this refusal, he merely proclaims his rejection of the Infinite God of Christian Theism; since, if God be infinite, His attributes, goodness, justice, or what not, cannot possibly be exactly like those of finite beings. The perfections of creatures, according to the well-known teaching of Catholic theology, are contained in the Divine Essence, not as they are in created things, but in a higher and simpler way. In creatures, these perfections (justice and mercy, for instance) are distinct from, and often opposed to one another: each supplements, and in some degree limits, the other. In God, all are identical, one, simple, infinite perfection. In a somewhat similar way, the white light of the sun contains in itself all the colours, which are merely its partial and refracted participations. There must be, relatively to us, a certain perplexity, obscurity and incompleteness in God's self-manifestations. Incomprehensibility is itself a divine attribute. Dr. Williams would have found the answer to Mill in so familiar a work as Bishop Butler's "Analogy."

The expulsion of mystery from theodicy, or the theory of Divine Justice,—and this is what Mill and Dr. Williams are really aiming at—would throw religion back into a barren

rationalism inferior in philosophical worth to the best pagan thought of ancient times. The great tragic poets of Greece, no less than Job and St. Paul, proclaim the impotence of man's mind to grasp the scheme of things entire, and vindicate the unfathomable judgments of the Eternal. Mill's principle would not merely ruin theology and paralyse faith. It would reduce the greatest masterpieces of secular literature to unintelligibility.

We have not had space to deal with the fundamental error—to speak categorically—of Dr. Williams' system: the notion, namely, that Christian Revelation is not a light from above, but a development from within: that it is a function of the human mind, instead of being, as the Catholic Church teaches, a supernatural *datum* communicated to us by God, and authoritatively proposed for our acceptance. Of course, if Catholic tradition is a system spun out of the inner consciousness of fallible men, it must certainly, like all the works and thoughts of man, be subject to revision—and rejection. What thought has done, thought can undo. The "forceful personalities" of past generations will have to yield to the "forceful personalities" of this. It is scarcely necessary in these columns to insist on the hopeless incongruity of these conceptions as applied to the interpretation of Catholic tradition. The prerogative of that tradition, in its own eyes, is to be something fixed and irreversible, because in origin divine. Its truth is not to be established by logical analysis, but is to be accepted by faith. Everywhere, it runs up into doctrines that transcend reason. The human intellect must always find itself in arrears in dealing with it. It is thus something quite different from a system of philosophy, though it fulfils, in a more excellent way, most of the functions of such a system. That it contains mysteries beyond the skill of reason to solve, is the best possible proof that it is not itself a creature of reason. The presence of these mysterious doctrines in the *depositum* is a strong argument for the "objectivity" of Revelation.

It is with real regret that we have felt obliged to confine ourselves in this article to the deficiencies of Dr. Williams' work. These were, unfortunately, so serious that a Catholic reviewer had no alternative. Otherwise, the industry and scholarship of the author, and the true devotional feeling of certain portions of the book, merited, and would have received, extended notice here.

J. BOLLAND.

A VINDICATION OF ST. COLUMBA OF IONA

IN a recent work¹ the Librarian of the University of Aberdeen undertakes to show that "the popular conception of St. Columba as the Apostle of Scotland cannot sustain the test of rigid historical and archæological inquiry." Colmcille,² it seems, was a sorry specimen of a saint and a very indolent missionary, but he was active as a politician, and used his great skill in that field to further the cause of his countrymen against the Pictish king and nation. Apostle, indeed, in the accepted sense he could not have been, since "long before Columba's time Christianity was already widely spread among the Picts, who had their own organized Church, between which and Columba there was either active hostility or, at best, a complete absence of co-operation." Colmcille's labours were confined to the small Scotie kingdom of Dálriada and the Pictish tribes of the borderland, with an extension or two into Inverness and Strathgairn. In later times his influence was "hugely exaggerated" by linking his name "with centres of early Pictish Christianity, to the detriment of the due renown of the real missionaries by whom the true faith was first taught in regions far beyond Columba's purview."

Here, certainly, is a startling thesis, stated in very emphatic terms. Scottish historians hitherto, whatever their religious beliefs and whatever their philosophic principles, have been unanimous in treating Colmcille's person and achievements with respect and even with admiration. They may, of course, be mistaken; but before concluding in their disfavour we are in conscience bound to assure ourselves that Dr. Simpson's inquiry is as rigorous as it pretends to be.

We may come at once to his main argument. It is to the effect that the conversion of the Picts was not due to St. Colmcille, but to Saints Ninnian, Drostan, Kentigern, Comgall, Moluag and some others. "North of the Forth and Clyde line the Picts, long before Columba's time, had

¹ "The Historical St. Columba." By Douglas Simpson, M.A., D.Litt., F.S.A., Scot. Milne and Hutchinson, Aberdeen, 1927.

² St. Columba of Iona is known generally as St. Colmcille, whilst St. Columba of Luxeuil and Bobbio is often called St. Columban. For purposes of distinction the forms Colmcille and Columban are to be recommended.

received the Gospel message from St. Ninnian, who, between the years 397 and 432, had conducted a great mission up the East coast probably as far as Shetland. His work had been continued by other missionaries from his central community at *Candida Casa*, and by the local centres which they established, such as those of St. Ternan at Banchory and St. Drostan at Deer" (p. 18). Here we have four clear statements. 1) St. Ninnian preached Christianity to the Northern Picts. 2) The mission was on a large scale, extending probably to the Shetland Isles. 3) Missionaries continued to be sent to these districts from the *Candida Casa*. 4) Two such missionaries were St. Ternan and St. Drostan. Now not one of these statements admits of rigorous proof. All we know for certain of St. Ninnian is the little that Bede relates of him in the third book of his History. From this we learn that he did indeed preach Christianity to the *Southern* Picts about the beginning of the 6th century (the date 397 given by Dr. Simpson is based on the legendary Life, and the date 432 is arbitrary). There is no evidence whatever that his mission was on a large scale or that it penetrated beyond the Grampian Hills to the Northern Picts, much less to Caithness and the islands off the mainland. Thus, until proof is forthcoming, this expedition and its fruits, the "Ninnianic foundations" underlined on the map (p. 107), must be regarded as purely imaginary. There is evidence that the *Southern* Picts evangelized by St. Ninnian very soon apostatized, for the "apostate Picts" referred to by St. Patrick in his letter denouncing Coroticus can hardly have been other than these, but there is no evidence that other bodies of missionaries were despatched from the *Candida Casa*, either then or later. To accept St. Ternan, whose life is extremely obscure, as a missionary from the Ninnian mother-house is an utterly unwarranted assumption. The same may be said of St. Drostan. As an example of Dr. Simpson's historical method it is interesting to note how this saint fares at his hands. The traditional account, enshrined in a late Gaelic entry in the Book of Deer, treats him as a disciple of Colmcille. Dr. Simpson resolutely refuses to accept this "myth." Drostan, we are told, despite his name, "which is a Pictish not a Scotie one," was of noble Britonic blood, and "was working in what is now Aberdeenshire about 520, just at the time when Columba was born" (p. 36). He had three companions (Scots or Irishmen from

their names), Colm, Medan and Fergus. The churches founded by these were so numerous (see map, p. 129) that paganism must have almost completely disappeared from northern Pictland before Colmcille landed in Iona. Unfortunately Dr. Simpson makes no effort to meet the questions which obviously need an answer before this story can be accepted as plausible. How does he fix St. Drostan's chronology, admittedly a ticklish historical problem? Until this is established with certainty how can he state categorically that the saint was evangelizing Pictland as early as 520? Whence did his Scotie companions come? From Dálriada? That would suppose that the Christian Faith was in a flourishing condition in the Scotie kingdom in the opening years of the sixth century, a supposition which there is nothing to support. Above all, if the activity of the missionaries was so widespread and so successful, how does he explain the fact that the northern Picts of Colmcille's time are represented by Adamnan as a purely pagan people?

On the same page Dr. Simpson goes on to say: "The evangelization of the Picts was also carried on by Columba's contemporary, Kentigern of Glasgow, who himself conducted a mission into Pictland that penetrated as far as Aberdeenshire." Again we have to ask what is the authority for this statement? Tradition connects Kentigern with the Britons of Strathclyde and with St. Asaph's in Wales. All that can be said of his expedition into Aberdeenshire, as of Jocelyn's claim that he despatched missionaries to "the Orcades, Norway and Ysaland," is that it is physically not impossible. There is not the smallest evidence that it is probable, much less that it is true.

Dr. Simpson continues (p. 19): "Moreover the work done by Ninnian was taken up, also in Columba's lifetime, by the great monastery of the Irish Picts, founded in 558 by St. Comgall at Bangor, in the Ards of Ulster. St. Comgall himself, as we shall see, accompanied Columba on the famous visit to the Pictish king, Brude Mac Maelchon, at Inverness, about which so much misunderstanding has arisen. His deputy, St. Moluag, extended his missionary activities widely throughout Pictland." Work of the same kind is attributed to St. Blaán, St. Donnan of Eigg and St. Finnian of Moville, after which the general conclusion is drawn (p. 20): "These particulars and many others which might be given, show how entirely mistaken is the common assumption that the

Picts in Columba's time were still sunk in paganism. On the contrary Christianity was already widely extended among them, and it was a Christianity quite independent of and anterior in origin to the Scotie Church of Iona. . . Even in Iona itself Columba's church was not the first Christian post, for we hear before his time of a college of seven bishops on the island, and it is recorded that on his landing he was met by two bishops who tried to drive him away." Here are very definite claims which it is the duty of the author to substantiate with equally definite and convincing proofs. Not even the semblance of a proof is offered, and the reader must find consolation as best he can in interesting footnotes on archæology. To enter into a full discussion of this page would serve no useful purpose. The author is drawing upon the "Lives" of the saints, and, where these fail, upon his imagination. In dealing with the Lives he neglects the first principle of historical investigation, which is to assure himself of the trustworthiness of his sources. When were these Lives written? By whom? On what did the writers rely for their information? In the huge overgrowth of legend can fact any longer be distinguished from fiction, and, if it can, to what extent? Until such questions are answered, the "Lives" may be utilized for purposes of romance; they have no direct value as history. Thus, however likely it may be that St. Comgall was one of St. Colmcille's companions on the first visit to King Brude, how can we be certain on the mere authority of Comgall's Life (for Adamnan speaks only of *comites* without giving any clue as to their identity) that this is true? And where in reliable records is there any evidence that the monastery of Bangor, either in St. Comgall's time or afterwards, treated the Pictish territory north of the Grampians as a missionary field? Where, above all, is the evidence that this was done prior to Colmcille's landing in Iona, or in a spirit of unfriendliness towards his establishment on the island? If again it be admitted that St. Comgall was one of St. Colmcille's companions on the visit to King Brude, it must likewise be admitted that Comgall's place in the visit was subordinate, unless it be shown that Adamnan gives a deliberately false impression of the incident. For the pre-Columban Christian settlement on Iona Dr. Simpson has the "authority" of a late mediæval Life in Irish, notorious for its legendary character. He adds in a note that "the earliest

kings of Dálriada were buried in Iona, which argues the presence of a Christian cemetery on the island." But whence is this information derived? No doubt from Fordun, who, in what Reeves styles (1857 edit., p. 417) "one of the anachronisms so frequent in Scottish hagiography," states that King Aidan's father, grandfather and great-grandfather were buried in St. Odrian's cemetery. Now the genealogy given by Reeves (l.c., p. 342) makes Odrian a contemporary of Aidan, not of Aidan's great-grandfather, and, if this genealogy is rejected, we are entitled, in a work of rigid historical pretensions, to know exactly on what grounds.

Of similar texture is the archæological evidence. "In Ireland, from which the Picts are so constantly asserted to have obtained their Christianity, a totally different series of early Christian monuments is found" (p. 77). Admitting this, admitting even the Christian origin of the Pictish symbol stones (though the symbols are not known to be Christian, and their connection with Christianity has never been satisfactorily proved) we might argue *a pari*: The early Christian monuments in Ireland are totally different from those of Britain (or those of anywhere else in Christendom); therefore the Irish did not receive Christianity from Britain (nor from anywhere else in Christendom). A very historical conclusion indeed.

So much for the main thesis of the book. The picture of Colmcille's person, drawn incidentally with much vigour, can only be described as a gross caricature. The Saint, it seems, had his finger in every political pie. "Amid these constant excitements, the turbulent blood of generations of hard-fighting ancestors, with all the bitter unreasoning factionousness of the Celt, would surge uncontrollably through his pulsing veins. Moreover, in his strangely mingled character Columba united a reputation for sanctity with that quality of unscrupulous craft which earned him the nickname, Crimthann [fox]" (p. 6). Then comes the ancient copyright cow and calf tale, the truth of which to some writers is much more certain than the truth of the Gospel which Colmcille is said to have transcribed. The unfavourable sentence, Dr. Simpson continues, "awoke all the passionate vindictiveness latent in Columba's soul. Blinded to every other consideration by the mad lust for revenge, he set himself to organise a rebellion of his kinsmen, the Clan Niall, against their sovereign King, Diarmait." There fol-

lowed a fierce battle, a bloody victory, a national synod of the Irish clergy, in which Colmcille was excommunicated, the counsel of Molaise "who told him to make himself scarce," Colmcille's hesitating acceptance of this advice when, two years after the battle, "he shook the dust of Ireland from his unwilling feet" (p. 7).

Here again is "rigid historical" writing of a somewhat peculiar kind. It is assumed that Colmcille exercised a profound influence on the political events of his day, though, apart from his "ordination" of King Aidan and his interference on the poets' behalf at Druim Ceatt, what evidence have we that he did? Supposing that his influence was very great indeed, where are we to seek for the cause? Was it because he planned and plotted like a secular prince of his house for the advancement of his race and family, as Dr. Simpson asserts, or was it rather because, like St. Bernard in the 12th century, he had turned his back for ever upon worldly ambitions and worldly rewards? Certainly the latter; though a paradox then remains to be explained, as in the case of St. Bernard, who found himself the greatest political figure of his age after he had broken irrevocably with the world and its interests. The alternative, which Dr. Simpson so confidently adopts, misses the whole point of Colmcille's life and makes his history meaningless. What gave the Saint his place among kinsfolk and contemporaries, what won their admiration and aroused their awe, what Adamnan recorded for the edification of future generations was precisely this renunciation of worldly ambitions, the substitution of an eternal for a temporal ideal and the heroic pursuit of that ideal until death. Dr. Simpson persists in regarding Colmcille as a secular prince of the Uí Néill family, disguised rather than dressed in a monastic habit, and domiciled by accident in a wicker cell, but the secular prince was exactly the old Adam which Colmcille had to put off to put on Christ and become what he was to all who knew him—a saint.

Crimthann—"fox," found in the Irish Lives only—Adamnan says he was called Columba from his infancy,—is given by them not as a nickname but as a name. The argument based on the word is therefore worthless. As well might one attribute "unscrupulous craft" to George Fox, the founder of the Quakers, for no other reason than the name he bore.

As for Cúl Dreimne, three points call for careful investigation: 1) Colmcille's connection with the battle. 2) The rights and wrongs of the struggle. 3) The effect of the issue on the Saint's departure to Iona. Dr. Simpson has convinced himself that the first is proved. He is equally clear as to the second: all the wrong is on Colmcille's side and all the right is with his opponents. He takes King Diarmait's decision in the copyright case as the only cause of the battle, ignoring the other cause—the violation of ecclesiastical sanctuary—which gets at least equal prominence in the ancient tales. He accuses the Saint (outdoing in this even the legend) of a "mad lust" for revenge, and he understands the constitution of the Irish state in 561 so perfectly that he can call the High-King a "sovereign" (evidently in the modern sense), and dub the resistance of the northern to the southern Uí Néill "rebellion." He connects with the battle the synod that excommunicated Colmcille, almost certainly against the testimony of Adamnan, who says (Bk. 3., Ch. 3) that the excommunication was fulminated for "matters of trivial importance that involved very little blame on his part, and wrongly, as afterwards became quite clear"—words that could hardly have been used of a battle which Colmcille had unjustly instigated. As to "shaking the dust of Ireland from his unwilling feet" it is in direct contradiction with the evidence of Adamnan that he left of his own free will "pro Christo peregrinari volens." We are not told by what process of reasoning Dr. Simpson arrives at the conclusion that this statement of Adamnan is "a tactful distortion of the truth."

Some amazing pages are devoted to the relations which existed between Colmcille and King Aidan. The Saint, "whose temper always itched to dabble in political affairs," impelled, moreover, by low motives of self-advantage, brought off a *coup d'état* and "intruded" a nominee of his own, Aidan the False, on the throne of Dálriada. "Sensible of the illegality of his action" he sought to justify it by a cock and bull story of heavenly visions. Adamnan (Bk. 3., Ch. 5) gives a very different description of the incident. Colmcille, he tells us, would have liked to see on the vacant throne, not Aidan, but Aidan's brother, Eoghan; an angel, however, appeared to him in dreams and convinced him in most vigorous fashion that his view was wrong. Coming back to Iona he found Aidan there before him, and im-

mediately "ordained" him king. Dr. Simpson assumes that to ordain is the same as to appoint. He might with equal justice hold that modern kings are appointed by the prelates who perform the coronation ceremony. Succession to kingship in Ireland, and therefore in Scotie Dálriada, was by election from a small group of eligible candidates (princes, to wit, of the *Deirbhfhine* of a deceased monarch). In theory the election was by popular vote; in practice it seems to have been a privilege of the nobles, but their choice had to be presented to a state assembly for approval. An appointment over the heads of nobles and people, in defiance of tradition and law, is utterly inconceivable, whatever the prestige of him who might attempt it. Nor is there any reason to accuse Colmcille of such a high-handed act. He found Aidan (who had a strict right to the office, for he belonged to the *Deirbhfhine* of a dead king) already elected. He had some doubts as to the choice; but on grounds which seemed convincing to him, he set these aside, and gave a religious sanction to Aidan's title when the new king visited him in Iona. To speak of this action as illegal is to talk nonsense. What law did it contravene? There is no proof that Aidan was more devoted to Colmcille's interests than his rival would have been, had he happened to be elected. The obloquy which Dr. Simpson seeks to cast on the King's character by emphasizing his nickname, "the False," is quite unmerited. This epithet was applied to him by the Britons of Strathclyde, because, in a triangular contest for power, he was wicked enough to support the Saxons against themselves. Aidan's real crime, in the eyes of Dr. Simpson, was wise and able government, which prepared the way for the later Scotie triumph over Saxons, Picts and Britons in what is now Scotland.

"The repulsive incident of Columba's savage treatment of the penitent king, Aedh Dubh, of the Irish Picts, and of the Abbot Findchan, who had received the suppliant into penance," is repulsive only when misunderstood. Aedh Dubh, a vile assassin, whose hands were red with human blood, was moved to reform his ways. Not only was he admitted to penance, but (after a negligible period of trial) he was recommended for priest's orders by the Abbot Findchan, and speedily ordained. Colmcille was indignant, as he had excellent reason to be. Ordination in such circumstances was a breach of divine and ecclesiastical law. The

Saint called Findchan seriously to task for his part in the affair and prophesied that it would not be long until the new priest returned to his life of crime. So in fact it happened, and the Annals, in due course, record his violent death. Here the only repulsive character is surely that of the Pictish King.

Enough has been said to show that Dr. Simpson's purpose in writing this book has by no means been fulfilled. He promised a "rigid historical and archæological inquiry"; he supplied instead a strong *ex parte* statement, in which the evidence, whether literary or monumental, is treated in an exceedingly loose and exceedingly unsatisfactory manner. Scottish history thus remains exactly as it was before Dr. Simpson wrote. Its early sources show that while others besides the Saint of Iona played meritorious parts in evangelizing the country (a fact universally conceded), still the great outstanding figure in that work was Colmcille. Except in the unlikely event of new sources becoming available it is difficult to see how this judgment can be reversed, given that the sources are studied by scholars well grounded in historical method and with minds free at least from the more vulgar forms of prejudice.

JOHN RYAN.

THE CARMELITE SCAPULAR¹

IN the issues of THE MONTH for June and July of this year Father Thurston has treated of the question of the Scapular, or at least of some aspects of it, with a wealth of illustration which excites the admiration of the reader. Nevertheless, many obscure points remain in the development of this form of popular devotion. Having had access in the course of my studies to many sources hitherto unexplored, the time seems to have come to put the whole matter briefly and succinctly before the public. Devotions do not, as a rule, spring ready-made *ex capite Jovis*, but have a long history behind them which it is often exceedingly difficult to unravel. Those who fear that a critical investigation might tend to lessen the spiritual value of these devotions should remember that this value is not so much due to the original private revelation which occasioned them, as to the approbation of the Church, so that their efficacy remains unimpaired even if a long cherished tradition loses something of its former glamour.

The earliest and, in fact, the only genuine account of the Scapular vision may be dated about 1361, perhaps a few years later. A number of writers of the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth centuries, enumerated in my "Monumenta historica Carmelitana," p. 313, have done no more than embellish the account they already found, without adding any detail based upon further research.²

¹ Article approved by the Superiors General of the Carmelite Fathers.

² In my earlier writings on the Scapular I have upheld, to the best of my power, the authenticity of an alleged Life of S. Simon Stock, or rather of two excerpts of it, by Peter Swanington, supposed to have been the secretary of the Saint. These excerpts were first published by Jean Chéron in 1642, who pretends that they were known to, and had been largely quoted by earlier writers. They are really an exceedingly clever and able conjecture of Chéron's whereby he sought to mystify his opponent, Launoy. Apart from the fact that in 1251 (the alleged date) Swanington was not yet born, every statement that can be investigated has proved an anachronism. Chéron's book has become very scarce, and it is only of late that I have been able to peruse it. It is easy to show on what materials he had worked, one of his authorities being Pitts' "De illustribus Angliae Scriptoribus" (1619). One or two of the old writers connect the Scapular vision with the chapter of 1247, Bale, in one place, with the Bull of 1252. The date, 16th July, 1251, given by Chéron, was chosen so as to make the vision antecedent to a Bull of January, 1252, and to account for the feast of Our Lady of Mount Carmel, 16th July, which, however, was only introduced at the end of the fourteenth century, and for an entirely different object; it was brought into

The original account is preserved, whether literally or only in substance I dare not decide, in the work "*Viridarium Ordinis B. Mariae Virginis de Monte Carmelo*," by John Grossi (Daniel, "*Speculum Carmelitanum*," Antwerp, 1680, I., 13f sqq.). This work treats in two parts of the Generals of the Order and of the principal saints, and in both parts a section is devoted to S. Simon Stock; the account of the Scapular vision occurs in the hagiological portion. John Grossi was General of the Clementist faction of the Order during the Schism (1389—1411), and of the whole Order from 1411 to 1430, when he resigned. He died August 1, 1435. Although his work was not completed till the last years of his life it may have been begun long before, and the sources on which it is based are of course much older. The two sections devoted to S. Simon Stock are probably taken from the narrative, oral or in writing, of one of the English friars who, during the Hundred Years' War, lived in Aquitaine, and whom for want of a more accurate description I will call the Anonymous friar of Bordeaux. The date of his account can be approximately fixed somewhere about A.D. 1361, the date of the death of Henry, duke of Lancaster (Wryneck), who is mentioned by name; it cannot be much later, or other names would certainly have been added. The sixteenth century writers have added many more, but they are too late and too unreliable to have much weight.

This is what the Anonymous friar has to say about the Scapular:

Frequently [S. Simon Stock] besought the Glorious Virgin, the Mother of God and Patroness of the Order, that she would vouchsafe to confer some privilege upon those who had the honour of bearing her title, and every day in his prayers he said most fervently:

Flower of Carmel,
Blossoming vine,
Splendour of Heaven,
Mother divine,
None like to thee!

connection with the Scapular vision in the sixteenth century. The determination of the place, Cambridge, was chosen on account of Swanington, the supposed secretary, having been East Anglian. But as foundations of friaries continued to be made until 1256, the period of downheartedness of the friars must be subsequent to that date, and the Scapular vision must be placed somewhere between 1256 and 1265; it is impossible to assign to it a more exact date; it may have taken place in any of the English friaries.

Mother of meekness,
Peerless and fair,
Thy children of Carmel
Save from despair,
Star of the Sea!

On one occasion, while fervently reciting this prayer, the Glorious Virgin Mary, Mother of God, appeared to him, accompanied by a multitude of angels, and, holding the Scapular of the Order in her hand, said: "This shall be a privilege unto thee and all Carmelites; he who dies in this habit shall be saved" (*hoc erit tibi et cunctis Carmelitis privilegium, in hoc habitu moriens salvabitur*). Hence the verses:

Si Ordinis in signo moritur quis, jure benigno
Solvitur a poenis, fruiturque locis amoenis.
Hoc impetravit Simon a Virgine cara;
Postea migravit scandens ad gaudia clara.

Therefore by reason of this great privilege divers noblemen of the English realm, as Edward, king of England, second of this name after the Conquest, who established the aforesaid friars at Oxford granting them his own palace for a friary, also the Lord Henry, duke of Lancaster, who is reported to have wrought many miracles, and many other noblemen of the same kingdom wore the Scapular secretly, and ultimately died in it (l.c., p. 139).

The first question which arises is: what degree of accuracy can be attributed to the Anonymous friar? His good faith is unquestionable; in simple style, without exaggeration or rhetorical ornament he tells the few facts which have come down to him concerning the life of the Saint. With great simplicity he records the impossible derivation of the surname of the Saint, Stock, from a hollow trunk of a tree in which he is reported to have found shelter during the time he spent as a hermit in one of the English forests; he narrates the "miracle" of a fried fish come to life again. His chronology is much at fault, but he gives a reasonable and intelligent account of some of the principal administrative measures of the Saint. On the other hand he has clearly done very little by way of research or inquiry. There is good reason to think that the Saint, after a short period of eremitical life in England went to the Holy Land, where

he must have spent a considerable portion of his life. Apart from the chapter of 1247 at which he was elected General, and the one of 1265 which he had convened but did not live to preside over, he must have held five others which are entirely passed over in silence. One of them took him to Sicily, while it is not known where the others took place. He established houses in four University towns, Cambridge, Oxford, Paris and Bologna, with the result that a very large number of young, and probably immature, men joined the Order; a considerable number of foundations were made in England, Ireland, perhaps also in Scotland, in Spain, and in various countries on the Continent. Of all this our author says nothing, presumably because he knew nothing. Not one of the later writers has been able to supplement this defect, because they also laboured under the same disadvantage: ignorance for want of research. The conclusion to be drawn from these facts is that while our Anonymous writer may be trusted when he relates the tradition which reached him about a hundred years after the death of the Saint,—for a popular devotion not a bad record!—he cannot be considered an authoritative witness for an earlier epoch.

Is it possible to go further back, and find earlier traces of the Scapular vision? I think it is. Father Thurston has done me the honour of quoting from a letter of mine of 1907 in which I gave him an account of the unexpected discovery of a passage in the Constitutions of Ballistarius of 1369 in which candidates for the Order are directed to bring with them, on their admission to a friary, "a small scapular and a gown (*tunica*) for night wear." About a year later I found the identical passage in another copy of the same Constitutions, of 1362, in a manuscript at Lunel in France which in the meantime has been published. Since then the same passage has again been found in a third manuscript at Moulins which belongs to the generalate of Peter Raymund de Grasse, and is dated 1357. All these manuscripts are more or less contemporary with our Anonymous friar, and whatever interpretation may be put on the meaning of the passage, that much is certain that some significance was attached to the Scapular, although the distinctive mark of the Order was, of course, not the Scapular but the bi-coloured, and since 1287 the white, mantle.

It is possible to go a little further back. In the Life of S. Peter Thomas, who died on the Epiphany of the year

1366, the biographer, Philippe de Mazières, relates how this Saint, shortly before his death, thanked God that ever since his entrance into the Order, that is, at least since 1320, he had never gone to sleep without his scapular (*Acta SS.*, January, vol. III., 612). This leaves the question between Father Thurston and myself unsolved, but it shows that already by this time the Scapular had come to be regarded as representing the full habit, since it was considered essential for a religious to wear his habit uninterruptedly day and night.

Can we go yet further back? It appears to me that we can, and may even touch the bedrock upon which the "Vision" is based, or at least find an incident, recorded in writing and largely read during the lifetime of S. Simon Stock which throws considerable light on the whole question.

In 1252 the General of the Dominicans, Humbert, commissioned Friar Gerard de Frachet to write the Lives of the most prominent members of his Order, among them that of Blessed Jordan, the successor of S. Dominic, who, having made a canonical visitation at S. Jean d'Acre, was drowned with two other friars and the whole crew of the ship which ought to have conveyed them across the Mediterranean, February 13, 1237. The body was recovered and buried with honour in the Dominican church at Acre. In the same town there was also a Carmelite friary where the following incident took place:

A certain brother of the Carmelite Order had made up his mind to leave the Order, and when he heard that friar Jordan had been drowned he became more and more troubled in his mind, and said within himself: "Truly, vain is anyone who serves God; for was not this a right good man, and yet he perished most miserably? Or else, God fails to reward those who serve Him." And having thus settled within himself that he would leave the very next morning, there appeared to him in the middle of the night a person of surpassing beauty and surrounded by a halo of dazzling light. Then trembling and wondering, he prayed saying: "O Lord Jesus Christ, help me and show me what that is." And presently there came an answer: "Fear not, my dear brother, I am friar Jordan about whom thou art in doubt; everyone shall be saved who unto the end serves the

Lord Jesus Christ" (*Salvus erit omnis qui usque in finem servit Domino Jesu Christo*). Whereupon he disappeared, leaving the brother mightily consoled. That same brother, as well as the (or a) prior of the same Order, friar Simon, a most religious and veracious man, related these things to our brothers (*Acta SS.*, February, vol. II., 732).

"Ce prieur est Saint Simon Stock," categorically declares the author of the "*Histoire de l'Ordre de Notre-Dame du Mont Carmel*" (Maestricht, 1798, p. 33), without, however, giving a proof for his assertion, only adding in a footnote that the Saint may have learnt the news on the occasion of a (most problematical) visitation in the Holy Land in 1261. For my own part I also think that in fact he was S. Simon Stock himself, and that at the time of this event he occupied the position of prior at S. Jean d'Acre, and returned to England either with the first batch of emigrants, in 1241, or at the latest on the occasion of the chapter of 1247. But supposing, for argument's sake, that the two were not identical, it will be agreed that the General of about 1256 could not have been ignorant of an incident concerning the Order which had happened nearly twenty years before and which by that time was common knowledge among the Dominicans.

I do not for a moment suggest that the two incidents were identical, but I think that in spite of radical differences the one throws some light on the other, and taking into account the psychological element we may say that the General would have been prepared, by the promise of salvation as a reward for perseverance, made to a brother in despair, for a similar promise on similar conditions made in favour of many brothers at a time of general despondency.

We have already said that the foundation near Cambridge in 1247 must have led to the influx of many young men, probably belonging to the class of poor scholars, so that in rapid succession further foundations became possible, in London, Oxford, Norwich and York (1256). After this date no other foundations took place in England until after the death of S. Simon Stock. But on the other hand the litigations carried on at the Papal court show that the difficulties with which the Order had to contend (and which had already begun some time previously) began to tell, while

there are clear indications that not a few of the friars, being thoroughly disheartened, either threw away their habit and left the Order, or at least sought admission among the Franciscans, Dominicans and even the Cistercians.

To me it seems almost a natural consequence that the Saint would have re-animated their sinking spirits by telling them how the Blessed Virgin had promised salvation to those who perseveringly wore the habit of her Order, and finally died wearing it.

Our Anonymous friar gives two instances of laymen wearing the Scapular secretly in honour of Our Lady; both may be unhesitatingly admitted as true. Henry, duke of Lancaster, was a contemporary, and it is unlikely that our author would have made a false statement which could be easily disproved. As to King Edward II., it is probable that being in peril of death at the battle of Stirling he not only determined that if he escaped with his life he would grant the Oxford Carmelites his own manor there, but that he also vowed to wear the habit, that is, the representative part of it, the Scapular of the Order for the rest of his life. He was accompanied on the campaign by a Carmelite, Robert Baston, whose duty it would have been to glorify an English victory in verse, but being taken prisoner by the Scots was compelled instead to sing the praises of his captors.

There may be other instances of lay persons wearing the Scapular, but I doubt whether they are sufficiently attested. Many persons left in their wills directions for being buried draped in the Carmelite habit, but this was, and still is, a widespread devotion applying equally to the Dominican and especially the Franciscan habit, and proves nothing for our present purpose.

From the rise of the Mendicant Orders many persons, benefactors of religious houses, eagerly sought for the benefit of being admitted among the "confratres" of these houses, so as to secure in return for their benefactions a share in the prayers and good works of the brethren, both during life and after their death. Many Fraternity letters are still extant in libraries, and the ceremonials of the Order exhibit the ceremony of admission. This agrees word for word with the corresponding ceremony of the Dominicans, and, of course, does not so much as mention the Scapular. We possess long lists of persons thus admitted as Confratres. On the occasion of canonical visitations the Superiors distri-

buted large numbers of blank forms, to be filled in by the local Superiors, in favour of benefactors. Thus Peter Terasse, General, handed to the provincial of the province of France four letters, and to the sacristan of Valenciennes six, to be given to the benefactors of that priory (July 22, 1504). The same General, on the 5th of October of the same year, admitted among the Confratres the bailiffs, burgesses and the entire population of Ipswich. In 1516 the English provincial caused Fraternity letters to be printed, in which in addition to the customary wording there is a list of all the indulgences and privileges available for the Confratres, according to the Bull called *Mare magnum*, and two supplementary Bulls, of Sixtus IV., dated 1476 and the following years.

In the meantime the Sabbatine indulgence had been much spoken of, and the General chapter of 1517 authorized the General to tax the provinces for the cost of a Bull of confirmation (*pro expedienda bulla pro die Sabbati, et aliis indulgentiis*; Acts of General Chapters, p. 358). For some reason not on record there was considerable delay, for this new Bull was only issued by Clement VII., August 12, 1530 (*Ex clementi*). In it the Pope does not directly confirm the "Sabbatine Bulls" of John XXII. and Alexander V., whose authenticity was evidently contested by the Papal chancery, but he confirms, and *ad cautelam* renews the indulgence itself. It contains a passage which must be quoted here.

Whereas, says the Pope, a petition lately submitted to us on behalf of our beloved sons, Nicholaus Audet, General, and the Provincials and Priors of the various houses of the Order of Our Lady of Mount Carmel, as well as of the members of the confraternities of both sexes established in the churches attached to the friaries of the said Order, contained that formerly our predecessors of happy memory, John XXII. and Alexander V., Roman Pontiffs, granted to such and all the faithful of Christ who entered the confraternity of Mount Carmel and caused themselves to be numbered among the brothers of such confraternities and promised to observe the rules of the same Order, *and to wear the habit of the same Order*, and to be called brothers and sisters of the same Order. . . .

This is decisive for the time of Clement VII.; as to the previous time all that can be said is that if such confraternities existed, the members of which wore the Scapular, they can hardly have been numerous, since they seem to have left few traces of their existence.

Henceforth, the Generals, in their letters of Fraternity, made special reference to the Sabbatine Bull, but, be it noted, there is no mention as yet of wearing the Scapular. Thus, in a letter of Rubeo, dated Rome, January, 1565 (Letterbook, No. 32): *Demum pronuntiantes quod Dei genitrix &c suis continuis intercessionibus, suffragiis et peculiari protectione te juxta tenorem litterarum apostolicarum &c post transitum tuum protegere et adjuvare dignabitur.*—Similarly in another of the beginning of the following year (Letterbook, No. 70).

In the spring of 1566 Rubeo set out for the canonical visitation of Spain which lasted about eighteen months. Like Terasse, he brought with him and distributed large numbers of such letters, but the ecclesiastical authorities having had their attention drawn to the clause referring to the Sabbatine Bull which they considered spurious, all the letters were confiscated and submitted to the University of Salamanca for examination. Four Masters in Divinity and Canon Law were commissioned to report on the matter, and in spite of suspicion of the authenticity of the Bulls the letters were finally (January 19, 1569) approved and restored to the owners.

If it was a humiliation for the General to see his letters confiscated, he now took a decisive step to put the whole matter in due form. Henceforth he is very explicit in his letters. Thus, under date of November 29, 1570: *Te hortantes ut non comedas carnes in die Mercurii &c, recites quotidie Pater Noster et Ave Maria ut signatur numeratis orbiculis* (the Rosary), *et subtus deferas habitum parvum coloris nigri in memoriam et honorem* (B.M.) *quae apparens beato Simoni hunc habitum sicut majores nostri scripserunt, ostendit et tradidit* (Letterbook, No. 459; also No. 483 of October 8, 1571).

Did Rubeo realize the far-reaching consequences of this step? We cannot say, but it is certain that from this moment the Scapular devotion, such as we know it, is in force. Thus we read in a letter of S. Teresa to Father Jerome Gratian, dated December, 1581: "I was delighted to receive your

letter last night with the rest of the scapulars. . . . The scapulars are in good taste and will excite devotion. Don Francisco asked his sister for one" (Letters, Engl. ed. IV, 265). *

Hitherto the ceremonials and rituals of the Order contained no formula for investing confratres with the Scapular. Rubeo published a breviary at Lyons in 1575; I have only seen one copy of it, in the National Library at Madrid, and have unfortunately failed to notice whether or not it contains such a form. But in the Constitutions of the Order, revised by the General Caffardo (Rome, 1586), the chapter on the Fraternity of the Order bears the title: *De modo recipiendi ad nostri Ordinis beneficia et de benedictione habitus*. In the course of the ceremony there occurs this rubric: *Deinde aspergat aquam benedictam super habitum et postea ipsum imponat personae recipienti (sic), dicens: Accipe vir devote hunc habitum benedictum precans Sanctissimam Virginem ut ejus meritis illum perferas sine macula, et te in omni adversitate defendat atque ad vitam perducat aeternam*.

This is, as far as my reading goes, the development of the Scapular devotion from about the middle of the thirteenth century to the end of the sixteenth. Whereas the Confratres originally were admitted to a participation of the spiritual treasures of the Order in return for temporal help, they now enjoy the former without much consciousness on their part of any obligation towards the Order.

BENEDICT ZIMMERMAN, O.D.C.

LETTERS FROM LOURDES

AUGUST 26th. Started for Lourdes at last! It seemed incredible after waiting all these years . . . the dream of my life come true, and funnily enough I had no "feelings" whatever—except unpious ones. I was glad rather than otherwise, because I really *am* going to please our Lady, instead of myself (for a wonder!). . . I suppose Lourdes is a reality? . . .

We assembled as usual at Victoria at 5.30 p.m. and met many people with similar badges to ours . . . yet not a word, not a bow! . . . Stretchers began to arrive, we were directed to our train. I knew only two people going and saw them both in the first five minutes on the platform amongst all that crowd. Decorously we took our seats. Many saw us off—B. among them; who threw in an enormous package of fruit to us at the last moment. We all sat in starchy attitudes looking in front of us: thoroughly English. Presently I felt my Irish nationality commencing to bubble . . . almost simultaneously Father D.'s—he is not English either—own nationality apparently began too, for upon commencing to investigate B.'s lovely fruit with a view to packing it away, before I had time to scream, Father D. was throwing it about our large saloon with a decision and sureness of aim that both won my undying admiration, and galvanized our fellow passengers into a semblance of life . . . for you really *can't* remain on your dignity when a nice young monk introduces himself with a banana! A packet of dates here and an orange there effected a general introduction, and we were all beginning to talk to each other before we knew where we were. But for Father D. I don't believe any of us would have arrived at speaking terms even by the time we got to Lourdes! He was so happy, so natural, and so at home, that it became infectious. . .

A very rough crossing from Dover to Boulogne. "Aha," thought I, being a good sailor, "I may be of some use," so I went up to the bows—where, by the Company's arrangement, the sick pilgrims were accommodated: the worst possible place, as one felt the motion of the boat more there than anywhere. Not only were the poor pilgrims being ill, but the nurses in charge of them too! Yes, they would

be quite glad of some help . . . poor dears, some of them were so upset they simply had to go and pray for a speedy death. . . Arrived late at Boulogne where coffee, in large bowls, awaited us. "Bowls! How horrible!" I heard one pilgrim say. Before we were again to reach home, he had reason to think differently; as will be seen in due sequel. Very nice carriages, allotted a corner seat, slept like a top till we were all turned out at 5.30 at Juvisy (a suburb of Paris) for breakfast,—and, oh thank heaven! a *wash!* Water to hand at last! For we were like sweeps. (Oh the dirt of the French railways! They use bricquettes of coal dust and lay the track with cinders, so you can imagine our complexions after a night of that!) The washing arrangements on stations are primitive. A pump, which you all crowd round and take dabs at in turn. A kind priest pumped for me and I afterwards returned the compliment. My face being enveloped in a thick and delicious lather as I conversed with him, it isn't surprising that later when bare he didn't at first recognize it.

What a picturesque old town is Poitiers, perched on its crag-like cliff. Though here the country is generally flat it abounds in unexpected hills, frequently crowned by wonderful old turreted chateaux. The train stopped this morning for so long—not in any station—that we began to fear something must be wrong. But no, on investigation it was only the engine-driver getting a drink from a friend on the line! Now anywhere else—except of course in Ireland!—the passengers would have been annoyed, especially as we could have done with something to drink ourselves . . . but dear me no! we nearly had hysterics over the joke of it! After many shrill whistles—and the French engines attain a note I didn't know before existed—and much flag-waving, we moved on once more.

Already everybody loves Father D. He visits up and down the train to everyone's delight, and his mere presence acts as a general introduction; everyone forgets they are strangers and all are merrily talking before he has been there two minutes. This was such a blessing, because often pilgrims never speak till they are on the return journey, so that much happiness and helpfulness is lost. His carriage is next door to ours—the sheep being separated from the goats on the train—women in one carriage, men in another; I don't specify which are the goats—and he does all our "chores"

for us, opens our obstinate lunch-bottles—such skill suggests much practice—and keeps everyone happy and amused.

What picturesque old places we passed through, before we came to the vine country around Bordeaux. Soon we left this fertile country and passed for many miles through a sandy desert, planted with thick forests of pine trees cultivated for their turpentine. About 9.30 p.m. we are nearing Lourdes; we see from the window the illuminated Cross on the hill. . . the Grotto, too, a blaze of light from the myriad candles always burning, and lo! our Lady's Statue as we pass. To our hotel and welcome slumber.

Many people had warned me of "the horrible commercial atmosphere of Lourdes" and "the terrible shops." My taste may be wrong, and my instincts awry, but I must confess I simply loved the shops! To my sorrow, I couldn't get a single picture of the quaint, narrow, eastern-looking little streets with their bazaar-like stalls, with their miles of rosaries and cartloads of statues and medals . . . what merchandize could be sweeter?—Everywhere were lovely things reminding one of the Lord or our Lady, never a dull establishment displaying modern female fashions or Paris hats, but rows and rows of the most entrancing little "Catholic Repositories!" Here it is like heaven, for everyone has come because they love God and our Lady. Everything is in its right proportion at Lourdes; only God—and the things of God—matter. They are the normal topic of conversation, and no one thinks a person has religious mania (or a budding vocation!) simply because he shows that his world revolves round our Lady. Lourdes is like our Lady's Retreat House, open to all the world. For every nation seems represented, both east and west, from the Normandy peasants in their picturesque dresses and lovely starched lace caps, to the pilgrim from the east in turban and burnous.

August 28th. Our Bishop said Mass at the open-air altar in the square, then we all went in procession to the Lying-in-State of the late Bishop of Lourdes, and so to the Grotto where the official preacher addressed us. The procession of the Blessed Sacrament and Blessing of the Sick are well known to everybody, yet nothing I have ever read gave me any idea of what it is really like. The faint singing in the distance, as the procession—out of our sight at first—starts from the Grotto . . . the priest in the Square leading the resounding invocations, "Seigneur, faites que je marche"

. . . "Seigneur, faites que je vois" . . . "Seigneur, faites que j'entende" . . . each invocation repeated twice or thrice and answered by the roar of a hundred thousand voices . . . and then the procession enters the Square. First the Children of Mary (in Mary's blue, with white veils) then the men, and lastly the Bishop—whose pilgrimage will be leading everything that day—carrying the Blessed Sacrament. The Children of Mary divide, and each half mounts the circular stairs leading to the Basilica, and stands grouped. The Bishop goes slowly round the Square blessing the sick individually with the monstrance. In actual numbers, more physical cures take place here (I was told) even than at the Baths.

As for those essential features of Lourdes, whilst the sick of each pilgrimage are being bathed, the rest pray outside with a priest leading the customary invocations. Among our own sick I may mention the following experiences. After her first bath, a grown-up deaf and dumb girl began to speak. Daily her speech became clearer, and before we reached home she had commenced to hear as well. A non-Catholic woman crippled with rheumatoid arthritis—who came out as a stretcher case, waved aside after her bath those who were holding her and declared herself cured. Her husband had intended to meet her on her return with an ambulance, "But I shan't need it now" she said, and she didn't.¹ A very bad consumptive case, who was very ill indeed on the outward journey, was so much better that she could breathe with ease, and seemed normal. A boy with a tubercular knee also knelt for the first time while making the Stations. He was just in front of me, and at the fourth Station I suddenly saw him kneel down . . . it was the first time in his life. Every patient went back improved in health, in spite of the inevitable fatigues of the pilgrimage. The atmosphere of expectancy and fruition made one realize what living with our Lord must have been, when He healed the sick and made the dumb to speak.

The Bureau des Constatations is now more strict than ever. No cure is announced until it has been absolutely maintained for a year. This may deprive our Lady of some immediate praise—for before, as soon as a cure took place, all went to the Grotto and sang the *Te Deum*—but it really adds to her glory and safeguards her honour; for she must be protected

¹ Two non-Catholics amongst our pilgrims became converted by what they saw and heard.

against the people who first *imagine* they have an ailment, then *imagine* it has been miraculously cured and thus bring discredit on the real cures. The Bureau makes that sort of thing impossible.

I have never seen such terrible specimens of disease as at the Baths, not during all my war-nursing experience. And yet there seems no sadness at Lourdes. The sick are absolutely resigned—indeed they seem the happiest people there. Here, where everything is in its due proportion, the sick are given their right place. They are the royalties, they always come first, a way is kept clear for them always to the Grotto and the Baths, they always have the "entrée" to the Royal Presence, for has not our Lord specially chosen them to be like Himself, crowned them with the privilege of suffering, allowed them a share in His Passion?

At 8.30 each night the torchlight procession begins. I have seen it many times described but I doubt if any description can convey what it is really like. During our stay there were an immense number there, partly on account of the death and funeral of the Bishop. A hundred thousand voices singing the hymn to our Lady of Lourdes, a hundred thousand torches, winding like a great river of fire. . . The front of the church is illuminated, the spire with blue lights,—a display which may seem garish, yet its beauty must be seen to be believed. There is no one to regulate this gigantic crowd—one never sees such a curiosity as a policeman in Lourdes!—yet all these thousands of people, all carrying torches, finally form in perfect order in the great square and chant together with wonderful effect the Latin *Credo*.

Yesterday (Monday) was full of incident. Like everyone else I began the day soon after 5 a.m. when the tinkling high-pitched hooters on motor cars and trams commence. Went to Mass and Holy Communion in the Basilica. Holy Communion is given continually from about 5 a.m. until 9 o'clock at the Rosary and Basilica churches—probably also in the Crypt as well, but I didn't go there ever at that time. A succession of prelates say Mass at the High Altars in these churches and even during these Masses, relays of priests—changing about every quarter of an hour—give Holy Communion without pause at the altar rails.

Another thing no book has made clear to me is the way the three churches about the Grotto stand in relation to each other—The Rosary Church is the lowest in the foreground, the Crypt on top of it but further back up the hill, and, crown-

ing it and the Grotto itself, is the great Basilica. It seemed beautiful to me—though architects find much to criticize about it—stretching its great white spire to heaven, nestling there among the Pyrenees, which stand for ever, snow-crowned and immense, to guard this sacred spot.

Monday was the day of the Bishop's funeral. And as this is a true account of my doings, let me at once say that I did not attend. I had had a hard morning from 5 a.m. and we were to make the Stations of the Cross after lunch—with prayers in English at the Procession of the Blessed Sacrament after that, and I felt I couldn't do it all, so I took the morning off, hoping to go up the famous Pic de Jer, the neighbouring mountain of Lourdes. It was another wonderful day—it has been real summer ever since we arrived—but reaching the funicular railway which takes one up the mountain, I found business suspended for the duration of the Bishop's funeral. Very just and proper, no doubt; however, I walked up the valley and there spent the most delightful morning. The roadway winds along the valley beside—though high above—the sparkling, rippling Gave, and at this hour there is a procession of old ladies returning from their marketing in the town to their homes in outlying villages—Basque peasants, picturesque and courteous, with donkeys bearing on either side huge baskets full of the queerest assortment of goods, the little "owner-driver," shawl round her head, and sometimes some of her family tucked in behind, perched on the top!

In the afternoon we made the Stations. These are wonderful, life-size statues in bronze set at intervals up the rough and stony mountainside—a vivid suggestion of the *Via Dolorosa*. Each Pilgrimage has its midnight Mass and ours was on Tuesday. Two hours' exposition before made the time seem rather long (after a strenuous day, commencing soon after 5 a.m.). I fell asleep after Holy Communion, suddenly and without warning . . . fortunately I was behind a pillar, so I hope no one saw.

And now, the pilgrimage being officially over, I must leave Lourdes for a little to tell you about our wonderful time at Gavarnie, only a few miles from Spain. We started by car at 10.30 in a morning of mist. It looked as if we shouldn't see any mountains that day . . . but as we left Lourdes behind, the mist began to break and never shall I forget the sight. As the clouds drew aside like a curtain, the vision of

loveliness revealed made one dumb. . . Peak upon peak the mountains rose from the mist, gigantic and jagged—yet not displaying the dazzling white one associates with mountains of snow, but delicate, rose-hued, opalescent, ethereal . . . the great range of the Pyrenees lay sun-kissed and glowing, as we rose higher and nearer to the eternal snows. Pierrefitte, Beaucens, Chez, Luz—through which we passed—each had its own particular beauty, its own charm, whether it was old chateaux, 12th century church, or simply its own incomparable natural loveliness. On through St. Sauveur with its wonderful gorge, beside which the road winds, cut ledge-like from the mountain side. It was near here three years ago that a party of sceptics lost their lives. Coming from Holland for the declared purpose of scoffing at Lourdes, as the charabanc conveying them passed along this road, by a strange judgment, it suddenly went over into the gorge seven or eight hundred feet below, forty-nine of the fifty occupants being killed outright. A tablet commemorates the accident at the spot where the coach fell.

It was here that Napoleon crossed into Spain, and surely Le Pont Napoleon must be one of the loveliest bridges in the world, spanning a gorge at the height of about a thousand feet. Looking down from this bridge the great height seems almost incredible, for the tiny stones in the bed of the river are as clearly seen through the crystal blue-green water as if they were only a few feet below.

After leaving St. Sauveur we passed Pragnères, overshadowed by the mountains where Charlemagne fought some of his battles. At last Garvarnie is reached—Garvarnie, lovely as its name, glorious in the summer sunshine, set amidst the snow! This is as far as anything on wheels can get. To climb the mountains to the great Cirque and snow-fields, if you are wise—or warned beforehand, as I was, you get a mule. If you are neither wise nor warned, you walk. So I engaged Auguste. Auguste was a mule, Spanish, and with much character. He was as surefooted as a cat and climbed marvellously. I had no trouble with him at all except once—and then it wasn't I who had the trouble but a Spanish Curé . . . but that comes later in the tale.

Higher and higher one goes till at last Le Cirque is reached, a great circle scooped out of the mountains—11,000 feet high at this point—where eighteen cascades pour down from the snowy heights above. Le Grand Cascade, nearly three times

as high as Niagara (and the highest in Europe) is an awe-inspiring sight. Snow is all around, for at this height it never melts. And oh the delicious coolness, yet there is no chill in the air, and one comes in summer dresses too! The amazing Pont de Neige spans the roaring torrent of Le Grand Cascade—the source of the river Gave by the way—a bridge of snow that never melts, upon which one stands, carefully it is true, for snow is slippery, even in summer.

Returning down the narrow path I got the obliging Auguste to break into a trot. To see him lift his feet over boulders and big loose stones was fascinating. He never appeared to look at them, he just knew they were there and felt. Suddenly, round a bend, a Spanish Curé blocked the path. I tried to stop my steed, but without success. So, "Attention, mon père!" I yelled as we got uncomfortably close, but the Curé, imagining, no doubt, I was merely on foot, (and rightly considering it was not my place to address a priest in that dictatorial way) took no notice. Then Auguste gave a flick of his head—as much as to say, "Leave him to me!"—and promptly *bit the Spanish Curé in the back!* I have never seen anything done more accurately and neatly, nor have I ever seen anyone move with greater rapidity than did that Spanish Curé. . . . I apologized as we hurried by, but Auguste wouldn't wait, so I couldn't say much. The Curé said "Il n'y a pas de quoi, Mademoiselle!" which I thought very handsome of him. I couldn't help thinking an English "Curé" might have said something more forcible and less polite!

September 3rd. Home! How sad was the parting from Lourdes! The day dawns at last, we have to leave, but always we take something away, Lourdes makes a mark in one's life that nothing can obliterate. The morning of departure we all met and our Bishop presented our offering to the new Bishop of Lourdes, Mgr. Poirier. How charming he was to us! And how young he looks! He said he had learnt English as a young man—whereupon our Bishop remarked that it must have been about five years ago. He doesn't look thirty, yet he said—with his delightful smile—that it was forty-five years ago, and that during that time he had forgotten all he had learnt! Afterwards we all kissed his ring and he spoke to many—always to the children—endearing himself to everyone by his graciousness and kind words.

The last farewell at the Grotto . . . and then the train. . .

Good-bye, Lourdes, good-bye . . . we look wistfully out of the carriage window till it is hidden by the hills.

But our adventures were not at an end. At 4 a.m. the train stopped and, sleepily gazing out of the window, we saw another train pulled up too. It was the Irish Pilgrimage on the way out! We shouted "God bless Ireland" and sang the "Ave Maria"—and a lady in my carriage suddenly saw three friends in the Irish train. Imagine meeting friends, unexpectedly, at four in the morning, at a way-side station in the middle of France!

A little further north, we stopped again—this time for over two hours, for the Paris-Bordeaux express had been derailed and wrecked a little ahead of us by anarchists unbolting the lines for thirty yards. The wreckage was right across both lines, so all traffic had to be diverted to small branch lines, making a tour through central France. The lines not being built for heavy traffic we went at a snail's pace, and altogether we were two nights and a day on the train. For nearly twenty-four hours we were without food or water and the sick cases suffered greatly yet uncomplainingly. Indeed, some of the hale and hearty had begun to collapse before we reached the main line again and got supplies. We had dinner at Amiens—the historic name of which will always now be connected in my mind with food, and food only! It was here—replenishing our water-bottles—that I made the disconcerting discovery that I had been washing some of the sick on the train with carefully doled-out rations of lemonade! (Several had said how refreshing it was!)

Without further incident, we reached Boulogne whence we crossed to Folkestone, arriving at Victoria at the witching hour of 5.20 a.m.! Some of us then went straight to the Cathedral for Mass. Not yet open! Sleepy but happy we sat on the steps. At last the doors were unlocked, and what a vision met the door-keeper's gaze! About thirty women sitting on the steps, all apparently with liquor-flasks slung round their shoulders—for Lourdes water-bottles look remarkably like those made to carry whisky!—a sight calculated to give a false impression to the casual passer-by. Headed by one of our good priests, this sleepy little congregation marched into the great church, where Mass was said at the Lady Altar. And so we came home, and I—like many others—am wondering how soon I shall be able to return to Lourdes again. . .

A. L. RUDD.

WHERE DOES ADAM COME IN?

"We are now able to fill in many pages which Darwin had perforce to leave blank, but the fundamentals of Darwin's outline of man's history remain unshaken. Nay, so strong has his position become that I am convinced that it never can be shaken."—Sir Arthur Keith, in his address as President of the British Association, 1927.

THESE are amazing words to have been uttered by a responsible scientific man who must be aware of the exact nature of Darwin's individual contribution to scientific knowledge, and must know besides that scientific progress is strewn with the wrecks of exploded "convictions." They were addressed, as the speaker assumed, "to an audience which . . . if not convinced Darwinists, are yet prepared to believe, *when full proofs are forthcoming*,¹ that man began his career as a humble Primate animal, and has reached his present estate by the action and reaction of biological forces." The italicized words may serve to justify the reluctance of those who are not "convinced Darwinists," to join those ranks, for, if full proofs are not yet forthcoming, what reason is there to be convinced? Some months ago we published an article² calculated to show how very various are the opinions of the scientific world on this particular question of evolution, and how really slender and uncertain is the foundation on which much modern teaching on the subject is based. The lively description which a *Times* reviewer³ gave of the chaos of scientific opinion a score of years ago can be fairly applied to the present time.

No one [writes the reviewer] possessed of a sense of humour can contemplate without amusement the battle of evolution, encrimsoned (dialectically) speaking with the gore of innumerable combatants, encumbered with the corpses of the (dialectically) slain and resounding with the cries of the living, as they hustle together in the fray. Here

¹ My italics.

² "The Babel of Evolutionary Biology," by Rev. James Brodrick, S.J., Dec. 1925, Jan. 1926.

³ T.L.S., June 9, 1905; quoted in Prof. Windle's "Facts and Theories," p. 94.

are zoologists, embryologists, botanists, morphologists, biometricians, anthropologists, sociologists, persons with banners and persons without; Darwinians and neo-Darwinians, Lamarckians and neo-Lamarckians, Galtonians, Hæckelians, Weismannians, de Vriesians, Mendelians, Hertwigi-ans and many more, whom it would be tedious to enumerate. Never was seen such a *mêlée*. The humour of it is that they all claim to represent "Science," the serene, the majestic, the absolutely sure, the undivided and immutable, the one and only vicegerent of Truth, her other self. Not theirs the weakness of the theologians or the metaphysicians, who stumble about in uncertainty, obscurity and ignorance with their baseless assumptions, flimsy hypotheses, logical fallacies, interminable discussions and all the other marks of inferiority on which the votaries of science pour ceaseless scorn. . . . The plain truth is that, though some agree in this or that, there is not a single point in which all agree; battling for evolution they have torn it to pieces; nothing is left, nothing at all on their own showing, save a few fragments strewn about the arena.

There is of course a spice of malicious exaggeration in this passage, but its substantial truth is vouched for by sober historians like Professor Kellogg in his "Darwinism To-Day" (1907) and by Dr. R. H. Murray in his "Science and Scientists in the Nineteenth Century." The latter work, not yet two years old, is a melancholy record of scientific obscurantism, of the desperate opposition offered to new ideas and discoveries by adherents of the old, and of the fate of "convictions," once held to be "unshakable," under the assaults of unexpected facts. It is a book which scientific men should have constantly before their eyes, for we have St. Paul's authority for saying that "knowledge puffeth up," and unless some antidote is kept at hand the scientist may yield to temptation, as Sir Arthur Keith has done, and degenerate into a dogmatist. It may be that the President was minded to utter a counterblast to the vigorous attack on Darwinism delivered by one of his predecessors in the chair, Professor Bateson, in 1914, but, whatever his motive, his unblushing advocacy of a crumbling theory was felt to be so ill-timed and ill-advised that even secular papers, not

generally sensitive to anything unorthodox, took umbrage at it.

The truth is that, now as never before, men demand that Science should be humble-minded. It is a commonplace that the growth of knowledge has but increased the area of surrounding ignorance, and an age that has seen questioned the universal validity of such fundamental "laws" as those of gravitation and conservation of energy, resents, especially in leaders of scientific thought, the reiteration of discarded theories or the assertion of "convictions" which are not based on proofs. Not long ago Sir Arthur Keith rashly intervened in a dispute between Mr. Belloc and Mr. Wells, the one surprising result of which intervention was to show that Sir Arthur had never heard of a biological work of capital importance, written by Professor Vialleton¹ in 1924, and traversing at almost every point the accepted dicta, not merely of Darwinism, but of Evolution itself. In view of Sir Arthur's statement that "man began his career as a humble Primate animal," and that Huxley's book—"The Evidences of Man's Place in Nature"—"settled for all time that man's rightful position is among the Primates and that, as we anatomists weigh evidence, his nearest living kin are the anthropoid apes," it may be interesting to quote the conclusion at which Vialleton has arrived from his anatomical studies.

Man [says the Professor] is a very independent and special type, belonging by his organization to the mammalian class. He is neither an order nor a family, because, though certain of his anatomical characteristics might allow him of being classed in an order, others such as his cerebral development and psychic peculiarities mark him off so definitely from the rest of the mammalia that to classify him according to the rules which apply to them is to be guilty of stupid pedantry.²

The issues could hardly be more diametrically opposed. Phrases like "settled for all time," "the impregnable position of Darwinism," "definite and irrefutable evidence,"

¹ "Morphologie générale: Membres et Ceintures des Vertébrés tétrapodes: Critique morphologique du Transformisme" (Paris: 1924). The writer is a scientific investigator of the first rank, belonging to the Medical Faculty of Montpellier University.

² Op. cit., p. 645.

which fill the President's discourse sound like bluster when confronted with the calm, cold dissection of evolutionary pretensions put forth by Vialleton in a massive work. It is the work, be it noted, of a convert from Evolution. In 1911 the Professor had established his name by the publication of his "Eléments de Morphologie des Vertébrés," in the preface of which he says, "From the first chapter to the last, the theory of Evolution has everywhere been my trusty guide, the only guide capable of explaining the facts." Twelve or thirteen years of further study, of profounder investigation have revealed the incompetence, not to say the deceitfulness, of that guide, and compelled the anatomist to dismiss it with something like contumely. We are not saying that Vialleton is right; that would be to imitate the President's unwarranted dogmatism; but we do say that until his discoveries are disproved and his arguments refuted Sir Arthur Keith is not right in claiming that the evolutionary battle has "ended in a victory for Darwinism." We are not surprised when *vulgarisateurs*, like Mr. McCabe or Mr. Wells, so commit themselves, but we have reason to complain when men of Sir Arthur Keith's eminence descend to the expression of what can only be called scientific bigotry.

We have said that he must have known the true character of Darwin's achievement. The great naturalist did not invent the theory of Evolution, but by his wonderful collection of observations which seemed to fit in with the theory he made it popular. And his disciples, many of them materialists, seized upon it as a convenient weapon wherewith to assault Christianity. Hence the "long and bitter strife" which Sir Arthur mentions. Those assailed hit back and, as unfortunately the most prominent of them were what we now call Fundamentalists—Protestants committed to a literal interpretation of a self-guaranteed Bible—the victory was not always for what was considered orthodoxy. But it was not the theologians only but his brother scientists that overthrew all that was characteristic of Darwin's contribution to the conflict—the suggestion, namely, that transformism could be fully accounted for by the process of Natural Selection. When Sir Arthur Keith boasted that the victory is with Darwin, and that Darwin's position is impregnable, he was confusing in a way discreditable to an accurate thinker,

the general theory of Evolution with the particular suggestion whereby the great naturalist succeeded in giving it vogue. The theory of Evolution is exceedingly widespread to-day and Darwin helped greatly to spread it, but his explanation of it is all but universally discredited as incapable of the work ascribed to it. In his trenchant criticism of Mr. Wells' "Outline of History,"¹ Mr. Belloc, for his victim's benefit, once more slew the slain, and by a great variety of proofs showed conclusively that Natural Selection is synonymous with chance, and that chance could never do the work of design, as the novelist had imagined. Moreover he showed, to his victim's discomfiture, that Natural Selection as a main factor of Evolution had been rejected, not merely by biased Papists like himself, but by scientific men of every creed and class for nearly a generation: so that, instead of being backed, as he fondly thought, by a solid phalanx of scientific conviction, Mr. Wells found himself in ridiculous isolation. There is no hint of this, the real bankruptcy of Darwinism, in all Sir Arthur Keith's eulogy.

From the actual words of the President we must conclude that he would rank himself with those who believe that "man has reached his present estate [from lower non-human forms] by the action and reaction of biological forces." He is concerned only with the immediate origin of man, not the origin of life: he does not go back beyond the early Pleistocene, which he reckons as distant from us by at least 200,000 years.² He actually says, though one doubts if he is using the words in their ordinary meanings, that "as we go backward in time we discover that mankind becomes broken up, not into separate races as in the world to-day but into numerous and separate species," and that "when we go into a still more remote past they become so unlike that we have to regard them, not as belonging to separate species but different genera." We wonder what Sir Arthur Keith considers the essential constituents of human nature: if, as

¹ See "A Companion to Mr. Wells' 'Outline of History'" (1926), pp. 9-28.

² That is his present reckoning. In the first edition of his "Antiquity of Man" the estimate was exactly double, 400,000 years. It is plain that the President keeps an open mind on some things. In the 1911 edition of his book, "Ancient Types of Man," he says that the "Neanderthal type represents the stock from which all modern races have arisen," but in "The Antiquity of Man" (1915) he asserts that Neanderthal man and his descendants are extinct races.

is ordinarily supposed, they include a material body animated by a living spiritual principle and capable of various activities both physical and intellectual,—such as we find it to-day—how could we imagine it specifically differentiated, much less generically, without losing one or more of those essentials, and thus ceasing to be human at all? This claim of the President becomes still more irrational if we consider on what evidence it is based. Until we come to the Neanderthal type in the later Pleistocene the only traces of human life on earth are suggested by three isolated discoveries—(1) the Trinil Remains (1891), (2), the Piltdown Skull (1912), and (3) the Heidelberg Mandible (1908). When we consider that a vigorous controversy has always raged about the “humanity” of the Java fragments (1) which consist of the top of a skull, two back teeth and a thigh-bone, that the jaw-bone found near the skull at Piltdown (2) is held by many to be purely simian, and that the Heidelberg Jaw (3) is only doubtfully human, we see that the evolutionist must arrive at his conviction of the supreme antiquity of man by what Huxley frankly called “an act of philosophical faith”—an act which differs from the faith of a Christian in that it is based, not on motives of credibility, but on mere analogies coupled with strong desires. It is surely not science to draw such tremendous inferences from fragments whose nature is purely conjectural, whose formation may be the result of disease or accident, whose age is largely a matter of surmise. We note that Sir Arthur Keith ascribes the so-called Java Ape-Man to the late Pleiocene, and says not a word about the disbelief of many authorities in its humanity.¹ Nor does he tell us that the stone implements found by Mr. Reid Moir in the Pleiocene are very possibly the effect of natural causes. He claims at the end of his oration to have avoided “to the best of his ability the rôle of special pleader.” Our readers may judge how small his ability has proved to be.

To utter truth in a matter so involved as the question of human origins one must tell the whole truth. The President

¹ Professor Windle tells us (“The Church and Science,” p. 221) that a writer collected, in 1912, a list of seven authorities of the first rank who believed the Java skull-pan to be human, six who have no doubt it is simian and seven more who think it belongs to a real intermediate type. Another observer classifies critics according to race: the English believe in the manhood of Pithecanthropus, the Germans in his apehood, the French in a combination!

attempted to decide the question by the testimony of man's bodily structure and the witness of the rocks. He dwelt upon the physiological similarities between man and the anthropoids, for the rocks and the dissecting-room can disclose nothing else, but he said nothing to show that he recognized that the theory of Evolution must account for the profound spiritual and intellectual differences between man and ape, to which on the hypothesis of a real descent from the brute must be attributed man's survival, for his "progress" really connoted a physical degradation. He became weaker, less fleet and hardy, more susceptible to weather, more dependent on diet, more liable to disease. It was due to his mind that he survived and advanced. Whence came his mind? Sir Arthur Keith makes much of the exact similarity between the human and the simian brains except in the matter of size. "It is just the expansion of just those parts [which are smaller in the ape] which has given man his powers of feeling, understanding, acting, speaking and learning."¹

"[No matter [he goes on] what line of evidence we select to follow—evidence gathered by anatomists, by embryologists, by physiologists, or by psychologists—we reach the conviction that man's brain has been evolved from that of an anthropoid ape, and that in the process no new structure has been introduced, and no new or strange faculty interpolated."

Here we have at last a confession of rank materialism. The soul of the brute and the soul of man differ only in degree not in kind. Only the accident of a smaller cranial capacity prevents the "Bandar-log" from claiming the rights and emulating the achievements of the human. It would be interesting to know to what psychologists the President has gone in his *selection* of evidence. There are many proofs of the generic difference between the living-principles of the human and the brute creations, proofs establishing a certainty so obvious and immediate that the whole conduct of human life, since the beginning, has been based on

¹ Yet Professors Elliot and Woodward assert that not brain-quantity but brain-quality counts. Why does Sir Arthur Keith so persistently ignore other scientific views? The brain of Neanderthal man is much greater in capacity than that of the average modern. Yet Sir Arthur Keith considers him a degenerate!

it. The soul of man transcends the material frame which it animates: it performs purely spiritual acts; it forms mental concepts and expresses them in articulate language; it recognizes moral responsibility: it has the power of choice: it fashions ideals, whether concerning art or religion or utility, and uses the body to give them reality; it invents; it creates. All this is utterly beyond the capacity of any simian brain, however developed. If size made all the difference the elephant, which has a larger brain than man, would be able to manifest those spiritual powers. We must suppose that, at one time or another, Sir Arthur Keith has considered the arguments for the spirituality of the human soul, but they have not apparently shaken his "faith" in evolution. The convictions of a life-time, however feebly based, are not easily overthrown. A story told of Herbert Spencer, probably apocryphal, nevertheless illustrates the mentality of the materialist. That eminent philosopher is said to have replied to an objection,—“That cannot be true. For otherwise my ‘First Principles’ would have to be rewritten. *And the edition is stereotyped.*” We are grieved to say that the convictions of Sir Arthur Keith seem to have become stereotyped. His Presidential Address was unworthy of the man and of the occasion. It was, as we have briefly shown, a painful exhibition of scientific obscurantism, unmarked by the humility of true science, dogmatic where it should have been merely suggestive, affecting certainty in matters wholly doubtful, ignoring necessary qualifications, hiding much of the truth. Although it was described in the *Saturday Review* as “Unburying the Hatchet,” it has happily done nothing to revive the old and discredited polemic.

Our age has learnt at last that, though there must always be warfare between Atheism and Christianity, there are no grounds for conflict between Science and Religion. Last year the Paris *Figaro* instituted an *enquête* amongst members of the “Académie des Sciences” with the title “La Science, est-elle opposée au sentiment religieux?”, and the upshot of some 80 answers was that, so far from there being opposition, each, rightly pursued, is an aid to the other. One reply may be specially noted, that of a Professor of the College of France. “A-t-il existé [he wrote] et existe-t-il nombre de grands savants ayant l’esprit religieux? Oui. Cette constatation a la brutale insolence d’un fait. Donc,

la question posée . . . ne se pose pas." Moreover, as Dr. J. J. Walsh reminds us,¹ four years ago a joint statement on the harmonious relations of Science and Religion was issued by a group of scientists, religious teachers and men of affairs,—another indication that the old mechanistic dogmatism about human origins is gradually dying. In the same article Dr. Walsh stresses the testimony of Dr. Millikan² to the utter bankruptcy of the monistic science of the nineteenth century, which Sir Arthur Keith is unhappily trying to revive. This is no time for unburying a hatchet which should never have been wielded, and would not if Science, and we must add Religion too, had kept more strictly to their respective spheres.

The question we have put at the head of this criticism is meant to suggest that, in this particular matter, those spheres are not wholly distinct, and that Reason, at work on the universe of matter,—the subject, *i.e.*, of the physical sciences—should not ignore the information provided by Revelation, coming from the Author of Nature. Nor, on the other hand, should believers in Revelation neglect the aids to interpretation afforded by Reason so employed. Even the indifference regarding everything outside matter and energy, which was cultivated by Darwin and by Huxley, and was turned into insolent ignorance by Hæckel and his like, is a wrong and harmful attitude in any real seeker after knowledge, resulting inevitably in a closed mind and the atrophy of many mental faculties. The truly scientific investigator into origins will, therefore, keep one eye on Nature and the other on the Book, interpreting the one by such rational powers as he possesses, and the other by the guidance of that authority which under God has brought it into being and guarantees it as divine. To take the Tennessee attitude towards the Bible is as prejudicial to truth as to adopt the futile monist philosophy. Drawing upon these two sources of knowledge which are ultimately the same—the God of truth speaking both through His works and in His revelation—the religious-minded scientist has no fear of being faced with contradictions, though he will still doubtless meet many enigmas. For the record of the rocks is necessarily very imperfect,

¹ *Catholic World*, September, 1927. p. 723.

² Author of "Evolution in Science and Religion" (1927) and one of the foremost scientific authorities in the States.

and the story in the Book is neither exhaustive nor scientific. Still, the latter does convey some certain information, which must be borne in mind if we are to interpret rightly the data of observation. To form theories without taking account of real knowledge obtainable from other sources is unscientific, not to say foolish. Accordingly, the wise scientist will not form any theory of human origins which has no place for the truths the Bible tells us, viz., that the present human race is descended from a single pair brought into being by Almighty God. He will scrutinize the rocks, and note the slow and gradual appearance of vegetable and animal life upon the earth. The undoubted progression from the few and simple to the many and complicated, the disappearance of some types, the persistence of others and the emergence of many more, will undoubtedly suggest a genetic connection between the earlier and the later, the simpler and the more complicated. On the other hand, the fact that there is little or no trace of this transformism—appearances and disappearances being abrupt and all the types successively visible being apparently fixed and complete in their kind: no one, so to speak, being caught in the act of evolving—will make him continue to wonder how it was brought about. The Bible does not help him here. In its broad lines, it is true, the record in Genesis involves prolonged and progressive creation, in an order roughly borne out by palæontology, *i.e.*, vegetable life before animal, fishes and birds before mammals, with man as the latest comer; and it is only in the case of the latter that the act of the Creator can be termed direct. Even in the absence of actual evidence of transformism, it seems a safe enough inference that the lower forms of organic life were somehow equipped with capacity for developing in a suitable environment into other, more numerous types,—an idea which Darwin himself expressed, at the end of the first and of all subsequent editions of his great work, the "Origin of Species," in these words—"There is a grandeur in this view of life, with its several powers, having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms or into one, and that . . . from so simple a beginning endless forms, most beautiful and most wonderful, have been, and are being, evolved." Although Darwin included man in this suggestion of development—a supposition which the believer must reject—this acknowledgment of the

outside derivation of the principle of life is very far from the Godless monism professed by Sir Arthur Keith and some other belated Darwinians.

But, turning to the case of man, over and above the difficulty of finding direct evidence of the fact of transformism, there is the greater difficulty in fitting into the system of what we may call orthodox evolution as derived from palæontology, the Creation and the Fall of Man. Mr. H. G. Wells once demanded¹ that Catholics should tell him the date and the place of the Fall, and he was no doubt disappointed that no answer was forthcoming: they could only assure him of the fact. We know that Genesis puts forward no definite chronology. The Book opens simply with the words, "In the beginning." The real enigma for the believer is to reconcile the apparent emergence of man in Java or in Sussex some hundred thousand or two hundred thousand years ago, with the literal facts of the Biblical narrative—that God created the first human pair "to His own image and likeness," relatively perfect, therefore, as to mind and body, and, as we learn from other parts of Scripture, supernaturally elevated to kinship with Himself and endowed with immortality. The earliest remains that are certainly human—the Neanderthal race—suggest men who, though large-brained, are still brutal in appearance compared with modern man, and, of course, altogether savage culturally. Unless we admit the possibility of pre-Adamite human beings, who became extinct before Adam's creation,—a suggestion which raises many difficulties of its own—we must look upon such prehistoric races as degenerate descendants of the first man, who had lost, together with Paradise, the relatively high culture that reigned there, developed brutish characteristics and features through living in brutish conditions, succumbed altogether in several cases to their physical degeneracy and, in others, emerged only after centuries of efforts to the civilization represented in Genesis iv., where Jubal, Tubalcain and others are mentioned as fathers of the arts and sciences. The study of prehistoric man, whilst thus giving a more vivid realization of the devastating effects of the Fall, leads us to suppose many centuries of degeneracy before, from the lowest savagery, the ascent began again. We have, thus, merely a choice of enigmas.

¹ See *G.K.'s Weekly*, Oct. 16, 1926.

Accordingly, when all is said and done, we must admit that we have not as yet a sufficiently certain interpretation of the whole Biblical record, still less a full enough collection and collation of the facts which palæontology can bring to light, to decide definitely for or against Evolution, even as understood in an orthodox sense. There is much need of patience, a quality in which many modern scientists are woefully deficient. Professor Windle remarks in his "Facts and Theories" (pp. 34 sqq) on the vast difference in tone between scientific monographs intended to be read before learned societies, the works which philosophize upon data of Science, and, finally, the popular manuals and text-books prepared for non-scientific readers. Writers who address readers of their own standing are exceedingly careful not to misinterpret fact or misuse logic, and so the first two classes of writings are characterized by a becoming modesty of affirmation. But the natural desire to dogmatize has full rein in the third class of books, of which Hæckel's "Riddle of the Universe" is a classical example, and Sir Arthur Keith's lecture a melancholy reflection. There is no room for qualifications and delicate refinements of accuracy, nor, apparently, time for prolonged tests and sifting of evidence.¹ Long ago an honest anthropologist, Andrew Lang, said of the pseudo-science of his time—

This kind of reasoning, with its inferring of inferences from other inferences, themselves inferred from conjectures as to the existence of facts of which no proof is adduced, must be called superstitious rather than scientific.²

And in a sprightlier mood an American satirist³ gives, as Rules for Writers of Scientific Editorials, the following—

When the situation clamours for a pardonable lie,
Please begin your observations with "As No One Will Deny."
For a modest little, bashful little effort to deceive
Kindly use the introduction "We Have Reason to Believe."

¹ The Talgai skull, dug up in 1914 in Queensland, figures in a "hypothetical genealogical tree" of prehistoric man, published to exhibit modern theories in the Rev. T. J. Walshe's "Principles of Catholic Apologetics" (1926), although a Government official afterwards pointed out that it was the skull of a black boy, lately killed and buried in a primitive deposit.

² "Magic and Religion," p. 5.

³ Quoted in Father Husslein's "Evolution and Social Progress" (1920).

When the information's doubtful, be no whit dismayed thereat,
Finding refuge in the sentence—"Tis an Open Secret That—"
You may search the very marrow of your controversial foes
With that phrase of cold disparagement "As Every Schoolboy Knows."
And a fraud will seem as pious as a missionary tract,
With the prefatory label, "It is an Undoubted Fact."

Modern thought, at least outside the Catholic Church, may take Evolution of one kind or another for granted, just as ancient thought was quite at ease with the geocentric system of Ptolemy. But modern thought, since Darwin's time, has had an anti-religious twist in regard to that matter, and has found in the modern non-Catholic religions no means of straightening itself. Let us, if we will or if we think the facts warrant it, adopt creative Evolution as a theory, by means of which to co-ordinate observation, but let us never forget that it is only one modern way of solving the riddle of the material universe, and that time, instead of removing, is multiplying its difficulties. It is the better policy in this dubious and contentious matter to remain an open-minded agnostic. The subject for the Christian is of purely scientific interest.

JOSEPH KEATING.

MISCELLANEA

I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

A STUDY OF BOLSHEVISM.

A HUGE book by a German author, Herr René Fülöp-Miller, is devoted to a detailed study of Bolshevism, considered not only as a political system but as expressing itself in various cultural reactions, and it has been rendered into English with the title of *The Mind and Face of Bolshevism*. (Putnam: 21s. n.) In a somewhat ponderous style, it demonstrates that Bolshevism is the complete antithesis of the civilization founded on Christianity, that it opposes, not only every manifestation of the supernatural, but even tries to counteract the spiritual activities of the soul, that its failure is due to its ignoring or denying the essential facts of human nature. The breakdown of the original Marxian gospel, although enforced with a brutality that surpassed the worst terrors of Tzarism, led Lenin to introduce some modifications in the direction of capitalism, and the domestic struggle which exists to-day amongst the Soviets is due to this divergence from the pure doctrine. However, we are not giving an appreciation of Herr Fülöp-Miller's book: we merely wish to point out that it suffers from the failure of its author openly and fully to contrast its subject with true Christianity. The moral corruption existing in Russia is far worse than he pictures it, for the decay of faith, due to the disintegration of the Russian Church, is far more complete than he conceives. He shows little inner knowledge of the state of religion there, such as is portrayed in Bishop d'Herbigny's writing in *Orientalia Christiana*.¹ He does not specifically trace the whole Russian tyranny to Jewish machinations, although it is notorious that members of that race are foremost in every branch of the State service, and, lastly, again through ignorance, he institutes in a final chapter a comparison between Bolshevism and what he calls Jesuitism, a comparison which can only be called grotesque. It is strange that a writer who has gone to considerable pains to investigate a new phenomenon in human history—the attempt to erect a civilization on the false principles of Marx—should, nevertheless, have taken his notions of a long-established Order, living and working within reach of him and open to scrutiny on every hand, from some ancient, anti-Jesuit attacks, which have no relation with reality. How familiar we are with those few supposedly immoral maxims, divorced from

¹ See "The Decay of Russian Orthodoxy," THE MONTH, January, 1924.

their context and maliciously misinterpreted, on which the enemies of the Society have always based their case! They reappear in this historical study. Herr Fülöp-Miller is probably too young to have heard of the celebrated case "*Hoensbroech v. Dasbach*" wherein was decided in the provincial court of Cologne, under date March 30, 1905, that Count von Hoensbroech, who brought against the Society the same charge as is here repeated, had utterly failed to substantiate it. Yet he may read of that case, of many similar unproved and unprovable charges, in Fr. Duhr's well known and accessible treatise "*Jesuiten-Fabeln.*" We repeat that this historian of Bolshevism has been most conscientious in studying the literature of his subject and has succeeded fairly well in analysing its spirit—why should he not have taken some little trouble to learn something about the Catholic Order which he so complacently traduces, instead of relying on traditional prejudices and copying out stale calumnies from tainted sources? He shows no acquaintance with those modern studies of Loyola and his system, associated with the names of the Protestants, Dwight and Van Dyke, though those would have enabled him to correct his grosser misconceptions. And, of course, he has not the slightest knowledge of the "*Spiritual Exercises*," wherein, if anywhere, is to be found the essence of "*Jesuitism*," the principles of which have no more resemblance to those of Bolshevism than there is between Christ and Belial. How often do even the learned thus "*give themselves away*" through an ignorant contempt, dictated by unconscious prejudice, for the various manifestations of the Catholic spirit!

J.K.

CATHOLICISM IN JERSEY.

THE Channel Islands are known to hundreds of thousands of holiday makers, but their history to very few. And yet to the historian, and especially to the antiquarian and archaeologist, they would prove a paradise, for they form a field of research that is still almost unworked. Distinct in their customs, their government, and (to some extent) their language, they well repay study, while their history is not devoid of dramatic incident. The largest and the most beautiful of the group is Jersey, which, 133 miles from Southampton, lies within sight of France, and with it we are here chiefly concerned. The Island, which is famous for its fertility, and particularly for its tomatoes, potatoes and pears, is a delightful sight in summer, and seems, indeed, to be one great orchard, intersected by the leafy Jersey lanes which are frequently completely covered in by the branches of the trees on either side that meet over head forming a long green tunnel of most

picturesque appearance. Yet a vivid contrast to this is supplied by the rugged coasts on the north of the island, where the cliffs frequently rise to a height of 200 feet and are most wild in appearance. The south coast, on the other hand, is gently sloping, with magnificent stretches of firm sand, so that St. Aubin's Bay probably surpasses in beauty anything to be seen in England. On one side of this bay stands the capital, St. Heliers, with the large Fort overlooking the harbour, and in the middle of the bay Fort Elizabeth rises up like a miniature Chateau d'If.

Before saying anything of the state of the Church in the Island at the present moment, a preliminary glance at some of the outstanding facts in the history of Jersey will not be without interest. As belonging to the Duchy of Normandy, the Channel Islands became the property of the English Crown when the Normans conquered England, so that it is the proud boast of Jerseymen that England did not conquer them, but they (as part of the Norman host) conquered England! On the loss of Normandy by King John they were saved for England from the wreck, and although so closely akin in many ways to the French (French is even yet the official language of the islands) they have remained ever since staunchly English in their loyalty and have resisted by arms all attempts to acquire them for the French Crown. Thus in the reigns of Edward III., Henry IV., and Henry VI. attacks were made on Jersey, and in the last-named reign Queen Margaret, wife of Henry VI., promised it to France in return for help in the Wars of the Roses. The islanders, however, saw to it that nothing came of this promise. But the most interesting period in the history of the Island is that of the Civil War between Charles I. and the Parliament. Jersey was throughout the struggle ardently Royalist, while Guernsey was equally enthusiastic on behalf of the Parliament. Sir George de Carteret, the head of what was then (as now) the leading family on the Island, raised a fleet of ten ships on behalf of the King, and it is not altogether surprising that Prince Charles (afterwards Charles II.) chose this place when in search of a safe retreat. He landed in Jersey in April, 1646, and stayed there several months, being received with the utmost enthusiasm. However, after the disastrous battle of Worcester in 1651 the Parliament had time to deal with the refractory island and sent thither a fleet under the formidable Admiral Blake.

Nevertheless, the islanders, under Sir George de Carteret, put up a sturdy resistance, repulsing the invaders in a four hours' battle, and it was not till after three days of fruitless efforts that the Admiral, by means of a night attack on St. Ouen's Bay, on the western coast of the Island, at length succeeded in landing all his force. Thereupon the islanders retreated to their three forts, St. Aubin's Castle and Elizabeth Castle on the south coast, and

the famous Mont Orgueil, most picturesquely situated on the eastern coast. These were, however, in too dilapidated a condition successfully to withstand a siege, and eventually had to capitulate, though on most honourable terms: the garrisons marching out with flags flying and drums beating. As a general rule, however, the islands stood apart from the main stream of English history and the more so as by a Bull issued in 1380 the Holy Father excommunicated all those who should disturb their peace, and at the same time he declared their perpetual neutrality. This neutrality in the wars of England, however, they lost in the time of William III.

The last attempt made by the French to capture Jersey took place in 1781 and brings upon the scene perhaps the most popular of the island's heroes, Major Pierson. On Christmas night, 1780, a fire was seen burning brightly for about eight minutes on the north-east corner of the island, and it was answered by a similar fire on the French coast. The next morning 2,000 French troops under the Baron de Rullicourt set sail for Jersey but were driven back by a storm and did not eventually land till January 5. Day-break found them in the market place and they succeeded in capturing the Governor of the Island and in making him sign a capitulation, and an order to the English troops to surrender to the French. The second-in-command, however, Major Pierson, refused to obey this and a fierce encounter took place in which both Pierson and the French commander were killed. The greater number of the French were slain, while the Jersey and English forces only lost 80 men. It is interesting to recall that two famous admirals, Kempenfeldt (the hero of "Toll for the Brave") and Hardy, of Trafalgar fame, were both Jerseymen, while of more interest to Catholics is the fact that Father Dalgairns, the well-known Oratorian, also hailed from these islands. And now, lest we incur the Scriptural reproach: "that it is a foolish thing to make a long prologue and to be short in the story itself," we will proceed to our more immediate subject, ignoring the very interesting but to us alien topic of the peculiar constitution and customs to be found on the Island.

The Christianity of Jersey goes back to the seventh century, the time of St. Helier, a native of Flanders, who, after living for some years as a disciple of various holy men in France, came over to the island to lead there the life of a hermit. He found himself surrounded by the religion of the Druids, and to this day there remain the great stones and boulders that we associate with that form of worship. St. Helier established himself on a large rock in St. Aubin's Bay (on which was later built Elizabeth Castle) and a small cave is still to be seen there in which he lived for some fifteen years. Eventually he was martyred by a band of Norse pirates. The other name associated with the early days of Chris-

tianity in the island is that of St. Maglorius who, with his companion, St. Sampson, the founder of the great Abbey of Dol, remained for some time in the Channel Islands. It is interesting to note here that most of the evangelists of the Islands were Irish monks (at that time the Irish Church was the glory of Western Europe) who stopped at these islands on their way to convert France and Germany. St. Sampson did for Guernsey, what St. Helier and St. Maglorius did for Jersey. In the latter island St. Maglorius founded an abbey at St. Heliers which he dedicated to that saint, and which soon contained no less than sixty monks. The same saint had already established Christianity in the little island of Sark before coming to Jersey.

But it was not till the Normans had been converted that the Church in Jersey really flourished, for then, in atonement for the cruelties and sacrileges of which they had been guilty, they erected numerous religious houses well endowed, and some of these survived for many centuries. Thus in the tenth century, the above-mentioned abbey founded by St. Maglorius having disappeared, a magnificent monastery was built in St. Heliers, and was occupied by the Canons Regular of St. Augustine. This abbey was suppressed in the time of Henry V. In addition there were priories at Noirmont (on the western point of St. Aubin's Bay), St. Clement's, Bonne Nuit (a bay on the north coast), and at Greve de Lecq (also on the north coast), so that the spiritual affairs of the islanders were well cared for. From these early days, too, dates the story of an appearance of Our Lady at a spot not far from St. Heliers, and for many centuries her footsteps were pointed out on a large rock there, from which fact the place was called *Havre des Pas*. We may safely say that not many visitors to what is now one of the most famous bathing places in the world know that it is from this occurrence that it obtained its name. Eventually this rock was blown up to be used in building operations.

It is noteworthy that all the districts of the island are named after Catholic saints, a fact that some authorities believe points to the monastic origin of the different parishes. There are twelve of these, and it would be a most interesting study to enquire into the connection that these twelve saints had with the island (if any), and to discover why they were chosen as the patrons of the twelve parishes. The hagiology of the islands would well repay study, and the more so as historians in the past have made erroneous guesses on the subject. Thus, no less an authority than Camden thinks that St. Heliers is so called after St. Hilary, the famous Bishop of Poitiers and Doctor of the Church, which is a palpable error.

It is interesting to note that the old connection with Normandy survived in one respect long after that country had been lost to

England, for down to the reign of Elizabeth the Island remained part of the diocese of Coutances in which it had been from the earliest times, so that there was to be seen the curious anomaly of an English possession being ecclesiastically administered by a French bishop. Even the Reformation in Henry VIII.'s reign did not put an end to this, nor the introduction of the English Liturgy by Edward VI. Under Mary, of course, the Mass was restored there as elsewhere, but the advent of Elizabeth altered this, the Islands were annexed to the see of Winchester, and the last Catholic Dean of Jersey, Paulet, (the highest Church official there is still the Dean) was dismissed in 1565. From the days of Faith, besides what has been mentioned above, there now only remain the ruins of four chapels of very early date (said to be earlier than the parish churches). These are La Chapelle des Pêcheurs at St. Brelade's, of St. Marguerite at Grouville, of Notre Dame des Pas at Havre des Pas, and of La Hogue Bie, a mile to the west of Mont Orgueil, though even these are now more or less indistinguishable. An interesting find, however, was made some four years ago at this same Mont Orgueil, when a very large and evidently very old altar stone was discovered there with the crosses cut into it still quite visible. When the present writer saw it, it was lying out in the open in a courtyard of the castle for anyone to walk or sit upon, but subsequently it may (or may not) have received more reverent treatment. Presumably, it came originally from the chapel within the Castle.

As regards Catholicism in the Island at the present day, the story is one of slow but steady growth. At first the visitor is apt to be surprised by the great predominance of Protestantism, and particularly by the strength of the Nonconformist bodies, in a community having such close racial affinities with France, but the explanation is to be found in the continuous political connection with England, and by the fact that by far the greater part of the commercial interests of the Island are bound up with that country. Time was when Catholicism was confined practically entirely to the French-speaking natives of what may be called the "interior" (as opposed to the trading and professional classes of the towns), and this despite the fact that no less than 6,000 priests and religious are said to have fled thither from France during the Revolutionary period. These good priests, however, had pledged themselves not to interfere with the religion of the islanders, and in consequence their period of residence on the island had but little effect, at least directly, though we can hardly doubt that their prayers and example must have had much to do with the very considerable revival of Catholicism that has taken place there since their time. It would be interesting to know how and where they said Mass.

But times are changing rapidly, here as elsewhere, and the days of unchallenged Protestantism are long passed away. Not only are

Catholic laity in the Island steadily increasing, but the Religious Orders are also well represented. In St. Heliers itself there are two churches, the one for the English and the other for the French, and the latter of these is a truly magnificent building well worthy to be the cathedral of a bishop and sufficient to make not a few of our Pro-Cathedrals hang their heads. It belongs to a community of Oblates of Mary Immaculate who labour strenuously among the French-speaking population. The church for the English Catholics is also a fine building though on a smaller scale, and it has lately had a new high altar and several side altars placed in position and dedicated. Apart from these, there are eight small churches or chapels scattered through the Island and mostly served from St. Heliers.

As regards religious houses there is a large Jesuit College and Seminary in which there are said to be no less than seventeen nationalities represented. Then, in addition to the O.M.I. Fathers already mentioned, there are Christian Brothers, and also Brothers of Christian Education, (de la Salle and Ploërmel respectively), while of nuns there are Carmelites, Daughters of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, Faithful Companions (two houses), Helpers of the Holy Souls, Little Sisters of the Poor, and an Orphanage of the Sacred Heart.

Thus the Faith is once more firmly established in the Island and the days are long gone by when Protestants were wont to boast that there was not a Catholic place of worship in Jersey. God has smiled once more on this beautiful island in which His Most Holy Body and Blood are once more adored in the Blessed Sacrament, and the Holy Mass again daily offered. The result is that converts steadily are received, and even Victoria College, the state-owned Protestant Public School, has (despite itself, one might say) provided five converts in the last few years, all of them Oxford men, and four of them now members of Religious Orders. Unfortunately the Catholic Relief Bill recently become law in England does not apply to Jersey, as the Island has legislative independence to a large extent, and English laws have to be passed by the local "States" (*i.e.* Parliament) before they apply there. However, great strides have been made in the past few years, and an ever increasing number of Jerseymen are coming to know of the blessings and joy that are only to be obtained in the bosom of the Catholic Church, and we trust that the prayers of the faithful will prove the means of bringing back many of our separated brethren, separated through no fault of their own, to a knowledge and love of the true Faith, the Faith of their forefathers before they were led astray, that once again they may all be gathered together in the Universal Church of Christ, and that there may be "one fold, and one shepherd" guiding and ruling over all.

DOM BASIL WHELAN, O.S.B.

II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

**The League
of
Nations.**

Despite the secularism that presided over its birth, despite the weakness it has oftentimes displayed, despite the sinister influences that aim at making it their tool, despite its official unconcern with the greatest force for peace in the world, the Holy See, we have always consistently maintained that the League of Nations is, in the present state of the world, the only possible bulwark against a repetition—and a not-distant repetition—of the World-War. This view is based not only on its being the next and natural stage in the evolution of the reign of law, which governs internally each sovereign community and therefore should extend to the external relations of the whole, but on the fact that none of its critics have even been able ever to suggest an alternative, and that the most hostile of them are those who are the most immorally nationalistic. Therefore, the present crisis of the League, due to the apparent inability or unwillingness of its chief constituents to base Right upon law and arbitration rather than upon force and armaments, should excite the keenest interest in the Christian patriot. He ought to insist, to the best of his power, that those who represent him should cultivate the Christian virtues of peace and charity in their intercourse with other nations, and, in order to do so with effect, he himself should have some knowledge of what those virtues demand. What is called moral disarmament—the laying aside of fear and suspicion in international relations—a disposition which is indispensable for the success of the movement for material disarmament, must necessarily precede the latter: in other words, public opinion must be persuaded that, although war may be necessary as a last resort on occasion, security can be better attained through such an institution as a powerful League of Nations than by relying on individual strength or partial alliances. And public opinion can be brought to this conviction only by a calm study of past experience and by a cultivation of the spirit of justice—the resolve to deny to no nation its real rights.

**The Press
a main Obstacle to
Peace.**

All this supposes not only practical Christianity in the individual, but a competent knowledge of foreign affairs. And for an accurate knowledge of foreign affairs, the ordinary folk are compelled to depend upon the Press. Ultimately, therefore, on the good will and right conduct of the Press lie the destinies of nations, for good or ill. Not without immense significance was the Report, handed to the Council of the League from the International Conference of Press Experts, which opened its sessions at Geneva, in response to a suggestion of the fifth Assembly, on August 24th,

for that Conference in its resolutions denounced both peace-time censorship and the circulation of false news "as detrimental to international peace." Sir Austen Chamberlain promptly pointed out that one resolution needed only to be enforced by the Press itself, namely, that on this very question of moral disarmament, in which the Conference appealed to the Press of the world "to contribute by every means in its power to the consolidation of peace by combating all hatred between nationalities and classes. I am sure," he added, "that the consequences of Press collaboration in this work may be greater than anything statesmen can do." But alas! what a gulf there is between aspiration and performance. The Jingo Press, here as elsewhere, still continues its campaign of hatred and vilification. The *National Review*, for instance, makes itself the apostle of the grossest nationalism. The *Daily Express*¹ loses no opportunity of sneering at the League, which is yet the charter of post-war Europe, many papers consistently ridicule the status and claims of the smaller nations, which, nevertheless, as sovereign communities, are juridically equal to the greatest. Most of the French papers, especially the nationalist ones, refuse to lay aside fear and mistrust of Germany. The Italian Press, now of only one complexion, imitates the Italian Premier in taking little stock of the League. Lately the *Giornale d'Italia* supported war on the ground that only by its means can poor countries hope to improve their conditions! If war breaks out again, the blame will not rest upon ambitious governments or discontented peoples, but on a section of lying, unscrupulous, irresponsible, pseudo-patriotic and un-Christian papers with which each great nation seems to be cursed. The International Press Conference hopes to meet periodically: let us hope that its committee will compile a dossier of flagrant offences against its resolutions.

Proceedings
of
The Assembly.

Even the well-intentioned Press must perforce exercise a censorship over the voluminous reports of the proceedings at the League Council and Assembly issued by the Secretariate, yet

only by their full perusal can one gain a proper idea of the work done and the spirit which animates it. The 36th session of the Council began on September 1st and was followed by the eighth ordinary session of the Assembly on September 5th, not yet concluded at the moment of writing. The Assembly reviews the work of the League during the year, dividing the agenda between six committees of its members whose reports are reviewed and discussed. The utmost freedom and frankness characterizes this discussion. Sir Austen Chamberlain, speaking on September 10th in answer to criticisms concerning the Council and suggestions of

¹ As a sample, it stated on August 31st that the League "spends £4,000,000 a year (most of it out of British pockets)," whereas its annual budget is less than £1,000,000, of which Great Britain contributes about one-tenth.

a further British guarantee of disputed frontiers, used language of remarkable plainness, but the same quality appears in nearly all the debates. The Assembly is a wonderful safety-valve for the expression of vigorous and divergent views, yet it is evident that all the speakers believe in the practical realization of the ideals of the League. There is none of that pessimism and cynicism that vitiate so many Press utterances, but, rather, a hopeful record of progress and a desire to move more rapidly. It is on this question of method that the members found reason to differ. The ideal of Locarno was constantly referred to, and a strong plea was made for its universal application. That would practically mean the outlawry of war as a means of settling international disputes. As was natural, the nations having most at stake showed themselves the least ready to take this decisive step without further study of its feasibility and its effects. Sir Austen Chamberlain explained—and his speech, although abrupt and dictatorial, was encouraging on the whole—that in this matter the British Commonwealth must move together, but he did not say what member was lagging behind. The discussion arose upon what was known as the Polish proposal, although it seems to have been also supported by Holland. The proposal, which was passed, unanimously and “with acclamation,” by the Assembly on September 24th, runs as follows:—

All wars of aggression are and remain prohibited. This Assembly declares that there is for States members of the League the obligation to conform with this principle. In consequence the Assembly calls upon members of the League to proceed to the conclusion of non-aggression pacts, inspired by the idea that all pacific means ought to be employed for the settlement of differences of whatsoever nature that may arise between them.

Poland, lying between Germany and Russia and holding within its disputed frontiers large racial minorities, naturally seeks all the security it can against aggression. Yet until, in one way or another, the minorities question is settled and frontiers finally fixed, the risk of doing anything which seems to stereotype the present status makes the Protocol idea unacceptable to many States. Moreover, in spite of the War there are too many, amongst the members of the great nations, financially or professionally interested in the maintenance of war as a phase of international policy.

**Compulsory
Arbitration instead
of War.**

The Protocol idea—Security, Disarmament, Arbitration—proved to be very vigorously alive during the assembly, and much dissatisfaction was expressed because, up to date, only 16 States (not counting Brazil, the membership of which is in abeyance) had accepted the Optional Clause of Article 36 of the Statute of the

Permanent Court of International Justice, which involves abandonment of the right to settle disputes by war instead of by arbitration. That is what Germany and France have done in regard to each other. That is, in fact, what the Allied Note of August 27, 1925, had urged upon Germany to do with the specific object of "rendering impossible . . . any fresh resort to force." Germany and France, therefore, (and for that matter Germany and Belgium) by virtue of the Pact of Locarno have bound themselves in advance to settle peacefully all sorts of dispute. That is, two nations in closest proximity, with a record behind them of secular animosity, each containing elements inveterately hostile, have, nevertheless, deliberately ruled out the possibility of armed conflict in all their future intercourse. And England, in case of any breach of this agreement, has promised to throw her whole armed might against the aggressor. One would have thought that this assurance would add to French security, and suggest that reduction of armaments which security is supposed to beget. Moreover, if two inveterate foes can thus be induced to sheathe their swords for ever, one would have thought that similar pacts would readily spring up between those nations especially who are naturally friendly and are not likely to quarrel. But France still shows a strange reluctance to diminish her forces in the occupied areas—a natural source of irritation to Germany,—and a member of the English Government, speaking in a debate upon the hesitancy of Great Britain to accept the Optional Clause, used words which seemed to imply the impossibility of any permanent pacts of the kind. Here they are :—

No constitutional Government can guarantee that the necessary legislation, that would arise in case of an *unfavourable* arbitral award, would be passed by Parliament. We cannot possibly guarantee that . . . and in the future we have *no guarantee whatever* that, if an arbitral award went against us, we should be able to carry on legislation in this House.¹

If these words carry their face meaning, what becomes of the Pact of Locarno? Are France and Germany and Belgium to consider themselves free to reject an unfavourable arbitral award and resort to arms? If not, why do we assign to their constitutional Governments a power which we deny to our own—the power of entering into permanent engagements? That speech may account for not a little of the uneasiness of the Assembly in regard to the real mind of the greater States. Since Locarno, particular treaties between pairs and groups of States for legal settlement of disputes have multiplied enormously. In September 1924 they numbered 120; to-day there are a hundred more; yet the British

¹ Mr. Locker-Lampson, Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, on July 11th. *Italics ours.*

Government stands out for the limited right of war allowed by the constitution of the League, and has refused (in 1925) offers of all-in treaties made by Sweden, Switzerland and Holland! After Locarno the Seventh Assembly declared that its principles "may well be accepted amongst the fundamental rules which should govern the foreign policy of every civilized nation." Yet this civilized nation betrays a strange reluctance to embrace it, though the Optional Clause has now been signed by erstwhile militarist Germany!

Amongst other subjects which occupied the Assembly was the question of the codification of the Economic Conference and the International Law which is proceeding apace, and which, when completed, will arm the International Court with a reliable instrument. This codification, of course, concerns what is known as positive law: the moral law—intuitive law, as one delegate called it,—is already codified in the Commandments. The work was originally undertaken by the Institute of International Law, founded in 1873, was carried on by the Hague Conferences, and has received a great stimulus by the creation of the League, which maintains a Committee of Jurists to prosecute it. Of greater immediate importance was the debate on the report of the great International Economic Conference, which was held at Geneva during May of this year—a Conference representing industry, commerce and agriculture, attended by experts from fifty nations, 344 in all, from which resulted a long and detailed series of recommendations, intended to remove whatever impedes the prosperity of those three great branches of human activity. These recommendations, which were printed in the Assembly's agenda, made a great impression on that body, which recognized that purposive economic warfare is only a variety of the general sort and that economic "disarmament" would make for general disarmament. The Conference recommended the abolition of tariffs as far as possible, an easier flow of capital, goods and labour between nations, and a better organization of production. Sir E. Hilton Young, for Britain, especially welcomed the dissipation of the most prevalent of economic errors, "the error that States could exist independently of each other without close mutual relations," whilst "the greatest and most foolish of economic fears was the fear that the prosperity of one nation would detract from that of another." The Assembly adopted the recommendations of the Conference and set up machinery for their realization. It is generally agreed that the new, or newly enfranchised, nations, born of the war, led into folly by inexperience, hampered their own industrial recovery and that of Europe generally by the erection of tariff-walls round their frontiers. The Economic Conference may have the happy result of demolishing those harmful artificial barriers.

**Disarmament and
Security:
Parallel Movements**

It was noticeable how persistently, courteously and gently the German members kept before the Assembly the question of disarmament,—bound in any case to be discussed, on account of the failure of the Three-Power Naval Conference and the dramatic resignation of Viscount Cecil from the English Government because he felt out of sympathy with its attitude on the subject. Many speakers declared their conviction that a practical measure of disarmament is a matter of life or death to the League and to civilization as a whole. If the burdens of war-preparation are not to be lifted by an organization which exists to hinder or prevent war, what is the use of it? And nearly everyone who discussed the subject deplored the delay in getting on with the work of the disarmament committee and the fact that the growth of security, due to Locarno and other treaties, had not been followed by a corresponding decrease in armed forces. The disarmed nations whose condition was meant by the Versailles Treaty to be the preliminary and model of universal disarmament were naturally the most eloquent, and it would be hard to answer adequately the complaint of General Tanczos, of Hungary, to the effect that the Allies bid their ex-enemies to rely for security on the League of Nations while themselves relying on military force. We have long been convinced that the main obstacles to armament reduction are the world-wide vested interests of the great armament firms, and although the League is supposed to control international traffic in arms, it has no means of regulating the output in States wherein these great firms are established. We agree with Lord Cecil that there is no question of such importance for the welfare of mankind as what Pope Benedict called "the simultaneous and reciprocal diminution of armaments . . . in a measure sufficient and necessary for the maintenance of public order in each State." Statesmen are fond of proclaiming that they have reduced their forces to the minimum required by security, but they forget that security is not an absolute standard but one which varies inversely with the size of armaments. Armies and navies are means of aggression as well as means of defence, and therefore the smaller and fewer they are, the greater the security.

**Canada
a Member of
the Council.**

A remarkable event in the Assembly was the election of Canada to a non-permanent seat on the Council; noteworthy because it is an international recognition of the sovereign status of each member of the Commonwealth, recently emphasized by Mr. Amery in his speeches at the Cape. Henceforth, as its Premier has proclaimed, that great and growing community will take a more prominent part in international affairs and, in default of the United States, help to interpret North America to the nations of

Europe. Having lived so long in unbroken peace with a powerful neighbour, having brought her own varied racial components into practical harmony, Canada is in a position to further the League ideals, and happily, in Mr. Raoul Dandurand, a Canadian Minister of State, she possesses one who can put her aims with force and directness. Nothing so hinders Europe, all agree, from recovering stability as the existence of some 30,000,000 souls under subjection to Governments not their own. One of the worst defects of the Versailles Treaty was the arbitrary way in which those large groups were separated from their fellows in various parts of Europe. That defect might have been remedied had the different Governments treated their new citizens as citizens, but unfortunately they have tried to coerce them into a rigid uniformity of language and culture. After saying that Canada was convinced that "a bad bargain [arbitrary award] was always better than a successful war," and after accepting in her name the recommendations of the International Economic Conference, he added a word about minorities. "It is the duty," he said, "of Governments to endeavour to make their people happy, and this duty extends to minorities as well as to the majority of the population. *It is the highest expression of civilization for a Government to make a minority forget it is a minority.*" And he went on to instance the education legislation of Quebec as an example for the whole world. If only the sentence italicized could be taken to heart by the rulers of the Tyrol, Transylvania, Silesia and other places where minorities have never been allowed to forget that they *were* minorities!

**Other
International
Conferences.**

The Economic and Press Conferences were not the only international meetings of whose labours the Assembly took cognizance. The Eleventh Congress of the International Federation of League of Nations Societies which met in Berlin in May and the twenty-fourth Inter-Parliamentary Conference which was held in Paris during August had accorded to their resolutions the privilege of publication in the *Journal* of the Assembly. The first-named dealt sympathetically and tactfully with the vexed Minority question, and urged upon its federated members the importance of educating public opinion in their respective countries regarding the limitation of armaments. The latter, whose meetings were marked by very helpful speeches from M. Briand and Herr Sollmann, a German delegate, had elaborated a complete scheme for armament reduction, advocating amongst other things a very sensible provision,—a series of demilitarized zones on exposed frontiers. The same idea was expressed in one of the Assembly debates by a Latvian delegate who actually proposed that the whole of the Baltic States should be neutralized. On the whole, the

eighth Assembly shows the League full of conscious vigour and promise for the future: what post-war Europe could have done, or now can do, without it, none of its detractors ventures to say.

War Guilt.

The declaration of the German President at the festival commemorating Tannenberg that Germany was entirely guiltless of the World War has not been taken very seriously, either by his own Government or the world at large, although it provoked a characteristic telegram from the ex-Kaiser, who, forgetting his legal abdication, signs himself "Wilhelm I.R." But it cannot but embarrass Herr Stresemann, who is labouring so zealously for a real democratic peace. In the assigning of guilt for that terrible catastrophe Germany's share will never, whatever President von Hindenburg says, be passed over, but the business had best be left to future generations. Perhaps some future jurist may arise in South America—a region prolific in the class—sufficiently detached to determine whether the Allies were right in demanding from Germany by Article 231 of the Treaty a full acceptance of responsibility. The innumerable memoirs and official publications of the last ten years, no doubt, furnish material for a decision, but who would face the task? Viscount Grey, who was at the heart of things, in his "Twenty-five Years: 1892-1916," wisely puts the blame on an impersonal factor—militarism.

Militarism and the armaments inseparable from it made war inevitable. Armaments were intended to produce a sense of security in each nation—that was the justification put forward in defence of them. What they really did was to produce fear in everybody.

And that is what they will continue to do until nations learn sense.

A New International Movement.

There was another Conference lately at Geneva; not deserving of the name of International, although that is suggested by its title, "The World Population Conference." Like the religious meeting at Lausanne, this Conference was inspired by, and mainly composed of, citizens of the United States and had for its object the study of problems connected with the birth-rate. According to the *Universe*, which has done good service in calling attention to the matter, the original composition and aims of the Conference suggested a campaign of propaganda for artificial birth-restriction, but, happily, owing to the foresight and energy of some Catholics, there arose from the meeting a real international body formed for the purpose of securing the rights of the family, and especially of the large family, against any legal or social interference. Thus, whatever the objects of the original body, this

new organization, the "Comité International pour la Vie et la Famille," comprising four already existing national societies and hoping for the creation and adherence of some half-a-dozen others, has been the eminently satisfactory result of the gathering. Dr. Halliday Sutherland, the energetic secretary of our "League of National Life," is to be congratulated on his share in the work.

**The
Over-Population
Scare Again.**

Not only in the World Population Conference under American inspiration has an attempt been made to advocate "race suicide" but here also at home under the respectable auspices of the British Association. Always it is the fear of over-population that serves to cloak more questionable motives. A speaker at Geneva calculated to his satisfaction that in 100 years the world would reach "saturation-point" with a population of 5,000 millions. He based his calculation on the "fact" that it requires the produce of $2\frac{1}{2}$ acres to support each individual—for life, we presume, although he does not say so, nor what the produce is. Other calculations give six and eight thousand millions, so the datas seem somewhat uncertain. Mr. Somerville discussed the matter thoroughly in our last issue,¹ so that all that need be said here is that no one who believes in God's Providence or even has an adequate knowledge of the earth's possible resources need regard the scares periodically engineered by neo-Malthusians.

**Scientific
Priests.**

Those that believe that there are real grounds for that conflict between Science and Religion of which something is said in this issue, are accustomed to set scientists and theologians in separate incommunicable compartments, and are proportionately disconcerted when they find the qualifications of both combined in one person. The scientific journal called *Nature*, which exhibits at times a narrowly "secular" spirit, remarked in a June issue that "a certain number of priests of the Roman Catholic Church have conducted important researches in various branches of natural science without interference from the ecclesiastical authorities." Whether the inference is that ecclesiastical authorities have been asleep or that they are becoming more broad-minded, the mentality displayed by the remark is sufficiently naïve. If all that Catholic priests throughout history, or the Catholic Church, by means of her Universities and seats of learning, had contributed to the sciences, were destroyed, we should be grievously hampered in research, and there would be many a woeful gap in our knowledge. Abbot Mendel's discoveries outrank in importance those of Darwin. Every branch of scientific knowledge, including the various depart-

¹ "The Devil of Malthus," September, pp. 202—212. See also *Catholic Times*, July 22nd, for a refutation of the usual Malthusian arguments.

ments of medicine, has benefited by the skill and observation of ecclesiastics. To-day Father Schmidt is amongst the foremost anthropologists and the Abbé Breuil has no rival as a palæontologist. Without boasting, we may assert that the number of non-Catholic clergymen eminent in the sciences is comparatively small. One of these days, *Nature* will hear of a young Spanish Jesuit, Father Almeida, who has solved a problem which baffled even Edison, viz., the production of an electrical accumulator, which should be at once of considerable capacity and yet not heavy and cumbrous. The storage-battery which Father Almeida has invented has actually ten times the capacity of any other of the same weight, and is now in process of manufacture by an International Company. When this new invention comes into use it will revolutionize transport of every kind. And all this has been accomplished "without interference from the ecclesiastical authorities!"

**P.R.
Advantages
and
Disadvantages.**

Some people are finding, in the results of the recent elections in Ireland, arguments against the system of Proportional Representation, whereas those results exhibit the perfection of the system. That a weak government is the outcome is not the fault of the system but is due to the fact that political opinion in the country is almost equally divided. The smaller parties have dwindled or disappeared because voters did not support them—a result all to the good. The advantage of P.R. is that it gives a due proportion of strength to every considerable party: its disadvantage is that it also gives representation to as many small groups as can find supporters and put up candidates. But these, which make Parliamentary government unstable, tend to disappear in a settled country where all parties work within the constitution. No doubt, the opposition will again take the oath of allegiance to the British Crown. It has been suggested, in explanation of the complacency with which so many practising Catholics committed what seemed objectively to be an act of perjury, that the phrase, "an empty formality," only referred to the nature of the obligation assumed. In other words, just as in the British Parliament avowed Republicans take the constitutional oath to the King and yet do not feel themselves debarred from doing what they can *constitutionally* to abolish the Monarchy, so the force of the Irish oath may be estimated in the same way. If a democracy as a whole may elect, not arbitrarily but for good reason, to change a monarchical for a republican form of Government, individual members do not fail in due loyalty by aiming at the result by methods of argument and persuasion. If that explanation is tenable, if taking the oath involves no obligation not to strive for its abolition, what otherwise seems a grave scandal would be obviated.

**Anglicans
and
Nonconformists.**

As the day for the bringing into Parliament of the Prayer-Book Measure approaches, Anglicans are experiencing the disadvantages and humiliations of belonging to a Parliamentary Church. Parliament as such is neither Christian nor pagan: it is secular or non-religious: yet members of Parliament belong to many other sects besides the Anglican and the fate of this domestic matter depends upon the good or bad will of these outsiders. The attempt to excuse the situation by the supposition that the Anglican Church represents the nation on its religious side has been repudiated by so staunch an Anglican as Canon Lacey, and indeed is shown to be ridiculous by the mere test of numbers. The humiliation arises from the attitude of several of the "Free Churches" which, having originally attained freedom by repudiating Anglican authority, now claim on the strength of their common Protestantism to interfere, immediately and intimately, with the domestic business of the Mother they have rejected. And, alas for the rest! many Anglicans welcome this interference as calculated to help them against their Catholic-minded brethren.

**The War-Office
and the
Country-side.**

Over the different departments of Government presides the Government itself, symbolized by its head, the Prime Minister, in order to keep those different departments in due subordination to the whole. Why is it, then, that the "Sitting Eagle," as the Canadian Indians have dubbed him, does not from his lofty eyrie keep an eye upon the War Office which time and again threatens to ruin the English countryside, to provide for what it thinks its "lawful occasions"? A while ago it was the southern coastal region which was to be devastated by tanks: now it is a number of Surrey commons, invaluable outlets for the multitudinous and jaded Londoner, over which it hopes to acquire "manorial rights" which would effectually destroy their amenities. It should not be left to the menaced citizen, aided by the press, to stave off these disasters: we submit that it belongs to the controller of the Government, the chief representative of the general interest, to safeguard the public against these departmental alarms and excursions.

THE EDITOR.

III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest.]

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

Capital and Labour: the Christian View [Dr. Seipel quoted in *Tablet*, September 17, 1927, p. 367].

Church, The, neither Occidental nor Oriental [J.-M. Simon, O.S.M., in *Ecclesiastical Review*, September, 1927, p. 243].

Education, The Church's rights in [P. L. Blakely in *America*, September 10, 1927, p. 519].

Evil and the Fall: an Anglican theologian corrected [J. Bolland, S.J., in *Month*, October, 1927, p. 302].

CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

Atheism, Spread of [B. Elder in *Fortnightly Review* (St. Louis), September 1, 1927, p. 347: John McGuire, S.J., *ibid*, p. 351].

Baldwin, S. Summerfield, Misrepresentation of Catholicism in *Atlantic Monthly* exposed [Dr. Grimley in *Catholic Gazette*, September, 1927, p. 272].

Colmcille of Iona, Saint, Vindicated [J. Ryan, S.J., in *Month*, October, 1927, p. 312].

Diabolism [H. Thurston, S.J., in *Studies*, September, 1927, p. 441].

Fyle's, Mr. Hamilton, "Religion of an Optimist" criticized [C. C. Martindale, S.J., in *Catholic Times*, August 26, September 2 and 9, 1927].

Keith's, Sir Arthur, monistic Darwinism questioned [J. Keating, S.J., in *Month*, October, 1927, p. 340: F. P. Le Buffe, S.J., in *America*, September 17, p. 539].

Machiavelli: a Christian estimate [J. E. Canavan, S.J., in *Studies*, September, 1927, p. 371].

Natural Rights impugned by Mr. McAdoo, ex-Secretary of the Treasury U.S.A. [*America*, August 27, 1927, p. 463].

Protestantism decaying in U.S.A. [*Catholic Times*, September 2, 1927, quoting Dr. H. K. Carroll].

Science really favourable to Religion [J. J. Walsh in *Catholic World*, September, 1927, p. 721].

POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

Bossuet and Union of Churches: a correction of a travesty [*Tablet*, September 24, 1927, p. 393: his greatness and place in history, *Times Literary Supplement*, September 22, 1927].

Brownson's Services to the Faith [V. Michel, O.S.B., in *Catholic World*, September, 1927, p. 755].

Cameroons, The Church in the [Dom Maternus, O.S.B., in *Tablet*, August 27, 1927, p. 285].

Cures effected through the mind not miraculous [J. J. Walsh in *Ecclesiastical Review*, September, 1927, p. 250].

Liturgy, The Case for [Dom Justin McCann in *Blackfriars*, September, 1927, p. 549].

Jews, Church's attitude towards [Bede Jarrett, O.P., in *Tablet*, August 27, 1927, p. 266].

Native Clergy [H. Brou cited in *La Cité Chrétienne*, September 5, 1927, p. 716].

Philosophy, Catholic, the only sound basis of Education [T. Corcoran, S.J., in *Thought*, September, 1927, p. 235].

Prize-fighting—the commercialized sort—degrading and brutalizing [Editor in *Catholic World*, September, 1927, p. 835, quoting the *Osservatore Romano*].

Religion in U.S.A. Schools: Protestant campaign to re-introduce [James H. Ryan, S.T.D., in *Thought*, September, 1927 p. 197].

Wealth, Undue Concentration of, anti-social and therefore anti-Catholic [H. Robbins in *Catholic Times*, September 2, 1927, p. 14: Some amalgamation beneficial, H. Somerville, *ibid*. September 9, 1927].

REVIEWS

I—HISTOIRE D'ISRAEL¹

THE name of this author deserves to be held in grateful reverence by all Catholics. In the domain of scholarly popularization of the Bible he has performed a gigantic work: he has provided the student of Scripture with a most helpful library. On the whole output of his prolific pen there is the hall-mark of a loving sincerity: the Bible is dear to his heart and he longs to infect others with his affection for it. Twenty-three other books by him are devoted to the same subject.

One might guess from the lines on which this first instalment is presented that the work will run to three massive volumes. Its scope is not only to set out the story of the Chosen People from the Creation to the destruction of the Temple (A.D. 70), but to comment, at least in a cursory manner, on all the canonical books. A stout heart is needed for such a colossal task, and we can only pray that it may be successfully completed. The volume before us takes us down to the death-bed of King David.

This reviewer has striven in vain to find some omission or inadequate treatment: there is throughout the thoroughness of the Teuton combined with the light touch of the Gaul. It is a continuous and charming narrative, cleverly filling up those lacunae that are always to be found in primitive literature and are so bothering to a modern reader. We would deprecate such treatment if it were intended to supplant the inspired book; but it is obvious on every page that the purpose is to supplement and thereby to whet the appetite of the reader for the original. The other plan is to read the Bible in a copiously annotated edition; but this has its drawbacks: it is apt to become a laborious study and, unless we are specially gifted, we are liable to be lost in the footnotes. Fillion wisely avoids lengthy disquisitions which would unduly hamper the progress of the story. It is a serious and solid presentment of the subject, intended to stimulate to further research. We trust it may succeed in its object, as there are still far too many Catholics who seem to regard the Bible as an extra and not a very desirable one at that.

The book is lavishly illustrated throughout. Sometimes it is not clear that the illustration has any direct reference to the page in juxtaposition to which it is placed, and some will think that the number of pictures taken from Egyptian and Assyrian

¹ Par L. Cl. Fillion. Tome Premier. Paris: Letouzey et Ané. Pp. 575. Illustrations 148.

sources is excessive. A chaldæan bas-relief (p. 456), showing a shepherd defending his flock against a lion, is most apposite, having several analogies in the Bible. At the risk of seeming captious the following criticism is offered: in the words "Machiakh," "Chaoul," and "Ichai," the "ch" represents a sibilant—would not "sh" be preferable, as the "ch" in oriental languages suggests a strong aspirate or guttural?

The sceptical will doubtless blame our author for accepting the miraculous—*e.g.*, the crossing of the Red Sea—too easily; but when one adverts to the excesses of the ultracritical school, one is reconciled to the policy of "safety first": rationalistic explanations are so liable to rob the sacred text of its simplicity and dignity, to say nothing of its sincerity. A Bible made easy by the rationalist is not only exceedingly difficult for the believer, it is also, with its crop of inconsistencies, most unsatisfactory to the lover of literature. Neither Moses nor anybody else had any business to compose high-pitched canticles on the deliverance from Egypt and similar topics, unless those events were truly extraordinary: otherwise an element of disingenuousness is introduced which is fatal to any inspiration worthy of the name.

A.F.D.

2—LORD BRAYE'S REFLECTIONS¹

THE outstanding feature of this unconventional biography, which is rather the history of Lord Braye's mind than of his external life, is the author's intense and practical Catholicism. Once possessed, in his undergraduate days, of the talent of faith, he recognized his duty to trade with it diligently, and since by birth and station he was a public man, he became a public champion of Catholicism. "The sole object of existence in this slipping-away world is for me, and should be for all, the extension of the Catholic faith" (374). To his perseverance was due in large measure the abolition in 1910 of the blasphemous Royal Declaration which a fearful and bigoted Protestantism had imposed as a test on the English Crown, and whatever resistance the House of Peers has made to immoral proposals, such as making divorce easier, was generally stimulated and organized by this staunch defender of Catholic morality. He showed himself also remarkably independent in his political views and can have found few amongst his surroundings to agree with him in his advocacy of the national claims of Ireland and his opposition to every form of imperialism. In fact, Lord Braye does not scruple to style himself

¹ *Fewness of my Days: a Life in two Centuries.* By Lord Braye. London: Sands and Co. Pp. 580. Price, 18s. net.

a Labourite, yet he has no good words for the death-duties and other forms of taxation which have so impoverished the land-owning class in our time. It is not, however, so much the loss of his money that he laments but its expenditure in wrong or useless enterprises—foreign adventures, colossal armaments and so forth. There is no difficulty, as to other matters, in ascertaining the writer's likes and dislikes for he constantly recurs to them: indeed, the book, which has no chapter-headings and follows only the vaguest chronological order, is confessedly a compilation from a variety of old notes and diaries, embodying the multiplied impressions of a lifetime. Lord Braye has been a great traveller, not only in Europe, but in America (North and South), South Africa, Asia (East and West), Egypt, India, Japan—but everywhere his chief interest is the condition of Catholicity.

Despite the variety of the experiences recorded—in the Army, in Parliament, in the hunting-field,—and the opportunities of a high-placed career, a sort of depression hangs over this book,—due, one gathers, to a melancholic temperament and frequent ill-health, but also, perhaps, to a sense of failure and frustrated effort. The author's views are strong, his sense, especially, that the lack of Catholic progress in England is due to lack of Catholic unity and consequent dissipation of energy. He laments the multiplication of diocesan seminaries and of boys' colleges; he would rather have a great number of small chapels widely distributed than ornate churches in towns and a deserted country-side; he deplors our want of liturgical practice and is particularly severe on the Douai translation of the Bible as read to the people at Mass. One feels there is much to be said for all his contentions, and yet they are not all-important. They are not the specifics he thinks them—they are summarized on pages 303-4,—and many other things will be needed to bring this country to Catholicism: the Christianization of industry, for instance, and the alleviation of the lot of the poor. But Lord Braye shows his thorough understanding of the spirit of the Church in his persistent denunciation of war, and of the various specious pleas with which a Godless world tries to justify it and to provide for its continuance. Like many others, he looks forward to the renewed Vatican Council for an authoritative statement of the conditions of international harmony, which shall brand war as a barbarous weapon unworthy of reasonable Christian men.

Pursuing his perhaps unpremeditated design of tracing the history of his mind, Lord Braye prints as appendices the series of political and ethical leaflets he issued during the war, with the title of "Scripts," several of his speeches in the House of Lords, and some documents regarding his foundation of a Chapel at Eton, which with astonishing bigotry the Head Master proceeded to put "out of bounds." Certain quotations throughout the

book remind us that Lord Braye is the author of various volumes of poetry published in early manhood; much of a poet's vision lies behind the prose of his biography and, it must be confessed, something of a poet's disregard of trifles. Such an amateur of the Greek should surely know that the editors of the "Westminster Version" have not "rewritten the Douay New Testament" (118), but are issuing a translation direct from the original. And how can a dweller near Windsor Great Park imagine that the use of bicycles is forbidden therein except to the woodmen? (301).

However, such inaccuracies as these are of little account in the light of the inspiration to be drawn from a life devoted to the service of God and His Church, and to the pursuit of no mere earthly ambitions.

3—THE CARMELITE DESERTS¹

IN this tastefully-printed volume Father Benedict Zimmerman has dealt with an aspect of Carmelite life which will be new to many of his readers. Just as amongst the Benedictines we find an often recurring tendency to stress the contemplative side of monasticism, and to discover that even in the cloister intellectual pursuits and community obligations may interfere with spiritual recollection, so it has been with many of those who wear the white cloak and brown habit of Carmel. The difference is that whereas the White Friars were originally hermits, the Benedictines were cenobites by their very institution. But the primitive Carmelite inspiration has never entirely died out in the Order. Father Zimmerman's monograph lets us follow in some detail the efforts which have been perseveringly made to maintain the tradition of an eremitical alternative to what very soon became, after the migration of the Order from Palestine to Western Europe, the more normal life of study and apostolic ministrations. Lack of endowments and of material resources forced them in the thirteenth century to become mendicants in order to maintain themselves at all. Even a hermit cannot in such a climate as that of England and France, or even Spain, live all the year round in the open air, and still less subsist upon what nature spontaneously produces. Some of the first Carmelite foundations in England were undoubtedly "deserts," where the community led an existence closely analogous to that of the Carthusians, each hermit occupying a separate hut and seeing little of his neighbours except in the discharge of public religious exercises. For the Carmelite, however, the "desert" was not necessarily a barren and arid region where

¹ *Les Saints Déserts des Carmes Déchaussés.* Par le Rev. Père Benoit Marie de la Sainte-Croix (Zimmerman). Paris: Librairie de l'Art Catholique. Pp. xiv. 300. Price, 15 fr. 1927.

heaven always seemed to frown. It only meant a place relatively remote from the haunts of men. Neither was this eremitical existence a special vocation which lasted until death. It was, as a rule, temporary in its character, something, in fact, resembling a Jesuit "long retreat," save that its duration extended over a whole year, or even several years with intervals between. In the book before us the reader will find much interesting information, historical, constitutional and geographical, about this Carmelite institution of "deserts." The work gives proof of a vast amount of original research, though the author admits that there is probably a good deal of manuscript material still to be examined. The investigations which he first began many years ago have been held up in the hope of making a more thorough study of the available sources, but other more pressing duties have interfered with this design. There cannot be a doubt that Father Zimmerman has done well to make public the information—most of which is new and much of it corrective of what has before been erroneously written—which he has so far collected. We must not forget to add a word of grateful acknowledgment for the illustrations, which in many cases are of notable assistance in elucidating the text.

4—AN AMERICAN CATHOLIC IN ANDALUSIA¹

THIS is a very pleasantly written and copiously illustrated account of a recent visit to Seville paid by an experienced traveller enjoying the indirect advantages which naturally fall to the lot of former members of the diplomatic service. Mr. T. Ewing Moore calls his book "The Heart of Spain," and probably there is no province of the peninsula which is more characteristically Spanish and Catholic and which can boast a more interesting history than that which embraces the basin of the Guadalquivir. The narrative before us deals primarily with the aspects of social and religious life in Andalusia as they exist to-day, but that does not mean that the author has neglected the records of the past. He has been exceptionally fortunate in enjoying the friendship of Mr. George Borrow, who, as his many contributions to the proceedings of learned societies prove, possesses a first-rate expert knowledge of the antiquities of the whole of this region. Still, it is to the description of the *Semana Santa* (Holy Week) with its all-night processions and moving groups of statuary, the dances of the *Seises* in the Cathedral at Corpus Christi and the Immacu-

¹ *The Heart of Spain*. By Thomas Ewing Moore, late Secretary in the American Diplomatic Service. The Universal Knowledge Foundation, New York. Pp. xiv. 330. Price, 3 dollars. 1927.

late Conception feast, the bull fights, the many flower festivals strangely combined with religious pilgrimages, and at the back of all the rest the art and architecture bearing the stamp of so many civilizations, that the average reader will most readily turn. The illustrations, reproduced from photographs, for many of which the author is personally responsible, are excellently chosen. There is also a good outline map of the ground covered, for the party visited most of the province, from Granada and Cordova to Huelva and Jerez de la Frontera. We may confess that we cannot quite endorse all the views expressed about historical matters. In relation to Christopher Columbus, more particularly, it seems to us that the researches of M. Vignaud and other recent investigators have done a good deal to demolish the Franciscan legend of La Rabida. The volume is printed in a style which does credit to the typographical resources of the Universal Knowledge Foundation, and we cordially wish it every success.

SHORT NOTICES.

THEOLOGICAL.

DR. J. P. Arendzen, in **Whom do YOU say—?** (Sands: 6s.), has added another to his admirably-practical expositions of Catholic doctrine,—and perhaps the most useful of all. It is a "Study in the Doctrine of the Incarnation," *i.e.*, a vindication of the truth which lies at the very basis of Christianity—the Godhead of Christ—and which, by a horrible perversion of loyalty, many so-called Christians outside the Church have come to reject. Dr. Arendzen is very patient with such "modernists" and with all unbelievers, showing, first of all, how likely a divine Incarnation is and yet how inevitably mysterious, and then proceeding to state and prove the doctrine, and to point out its important and far-reaching consequences. The non-Catholic constantly blunders, even when he accepts Christ's divinity, in his explanation of the results of the Hypostatic Union, because he has no clear and consistent philosophy to aid him. Anxious to safeguard the divinity, he obscures the humanity, and *vice versa*. Dr. Arendzen's discussion of the Knowledge and the Will of Christ will indicate how both errors are avoided in Catholic teaching without rationalizing what is essentially mysterious. "True God and true Man"—Christ was both. We know the fact but the manner only partially. The history or development of the doctrine, its parallels in false religions, are also adequately dealt with in this excellent treatise, which, as it avoids the technicalities of theology, will be a great boon to all who have or aspire to teach the faith. We may be permitted an expression of regret that one so well-read and so generally accurate should quote and so add to the vogue of that apocryphal utterance, *credo quia impossibile* (74), which is an invention of the rationalist. What Tertullian said was *certum est quia impossibile*—an expression quite intelligible in its context (See *Antidote* III., 64, C.T.S.).

A little work on *The Church and Divorce* (Herder: 4s.), by the Rev. Thomas Mahon, S.T.L., B.C.L., is divided into two sections of about equal length, the first dealing with the teaching of Scripture on divorce, the second with the argument from Christian tradition. The author adopts a somewhat unusual view of the critical passage, Matt. xix. 1-10. He holds* that the question proposed by the Pharisee was designed solely to involve our Lord in the dispute between the rival schools of Hillel and Shammai, and that His reply in v. 9 condemned the lax views of the Hillelites without expressing any opinion regarding those of the stricter party. This exegesis appears to us very doubtful. Nor does Father Mahon give us any discussion of the serious and well-known difficulties urged against it. We certainly cannot allow that it is, as he contends, the only possible interpretation. The second part of the book contains a succinct but useful historical account of the Church's vindication of the indissolubility of marriage from the earliest times to the Council of Trent. The statements regarding the Greek Church need, it is true, some correction. There can be no question but that divorce was permitted there in the seventh century. The evidence afforded by the Penitential of Theodore of Canterbury is conclusive.

BIBLICAL.

Yet another volume, the third, has appeared of this large collection of passages from Ante-Nicene writers bearing on the Gospels, which Dr. Harold Smith is editing with the title *Ante-Nicene Exegesis of the Gospels* (S.P.C.K.: 7s. 6d. net); inasmuch as we have come only to Matt. xviii. and John viii., we surmise that there must be at least two and probably three volumes yet to appear. The publication is assisted by a grant from London University, and the printing (which is excellent) has been carried out at the (doubtless Anglican) "diocesan press, Madras." We have already found it useful to have such a collection of passages easily available; possibly, however, less so than might at first sight appear, because of the very large amount of space taken up by Origen. He was erratic in his ideas, and his knowledge of Hebrew can bear no comparison to St. Jerome's, who was also, of course, familiar with Latin and the Latin Church, no less than with the East; upon the whole we are inclined to think Origen a somewhat overrated person, but in any case he is a study apart, and his comments might perhaps have been printed apart. However, we must be thankful for what we are offered. On the Petrine text (Matt. xvi. 13-19) Origen evidently wishes to base an argument in favour of reincarnation, alleging the various views reported in the Gospels about Christ (pp. 148-9), and he is not very favourable to any peculiar prerogative of St. Peter's, rather seeking to apply what is said of him to all (pp. 151-6); nevertheless, he calls Peter "that great foundation of the Church, and most solid rock, on which Christ founded the Church," and some similar expressions are quoted (p. 156). He appears also to deny to bishops the power of binding and loosing, unless they have a virtuous character (p. 155). But we must forbear further references, though there is much that is interesting in the various writers, and merely insist in conclusion upon the development of doctrine. *Antiquitas saeculi inventus ecclesiae*, we

might say; as time went on, the Church and her scholars and teachers came to understand the Gospels far better, and even to-day, at least in some directions, there is certain and ceaseless advance.

PHILOSOPHY.

One of the noteworthy features of the present age in regard to its philosophical interests, is the increasing attention that is being paid in many quarters to the philosophy of Plato. The recent developments of mathematical and physical sciences on the one hand, and the study of mysticism and religion on the other, have combined to give a renewed impulse to Platonic scholarship. In England, where the study of this philosopher had traditionally been pursued in a somewhat amateurish and purely literary fashion, Prof. A. E. Taylor's recent work stands out as a landmark. We have another testimony of the growing importance of Platonism in France, in the two volumes of Canon A. Diès of Rennes, *Autour de Platon* (Beauchesne: 40 fr.), published in that prolific and enterprising series, the *Archives de Philosophie*. The book deals with all the main questions concerning the life and works of Plato, his relation to Socrates, the historical value of the dialogues, their chronology and the development of Plato's thought. The reader of these pages who is not an expert in scholarship or in philosophy will find a surprising amount of accurate information in both departments, conveyed in a style that is always clear and readable. It is no small achievement to bring such very recondite material within the comprehension of the general reader. The discussions and controversies of professional scholars are liable, even in these modern days, to a certain diffuseness and prolixity. Canon Diès has succeeded admirably in condensing and summing up the matters in dispute. A good instance is the concluding chapter of Volume I., where, in the space of some thirty pages, the views of the leading modern critics on the Xenophontic and Platonic Socrates are expounded and discussed. The second volume contains essays on the philosophy and theology of Plato, and here, too, M. Diès has shown his skill in exposition and compression. Perhaps the most interesting section in this volume is that on the religion of Plato, and its connection with the philosopher's general system. He regards Plato, and surely with reason, as a religious reformer, and insists that, notwithstanding the mythical and semi-poetical form in which much of his theology was cast, Plato desired to have a theology purged of fable and founded upon rational convictions and intellectual beliefs—in a word, on truth. This is a point well worth making in view of the too frequent perversion of Platonism by modern writers of the "mystical" school. Altogether, there is abundant interest for the general philosophical reader in these two volumes.

DEVOTIONAL.

Scholars will welcome the second edition of *The Confessions of Augustine*, edited by John Gibb, D.D., and William Montgomery, B.D. (University Press, Cambridge: 15s. net), in the Cambridge Patristic Texts. The readers of this famous book must often feel the need of such historical and grammatical help as is here afforded by two well-known

scholars. The principal addition is an essay on Manicheism, in the Introduction.

Each new book by Dom Anscar Vonier, the Abbot of Buckfast, dealing with the mysteries of the Faith or the mystery that is man or the unfathomable mystery of Christ's personality, impresses us as the product of a mind at once alert and profound, able to present truth, already substantially known, in a fresh and vivid manner, and especially to show its relation to conduct. These qualities find full illustration in the retreat-conferences which he has lately published with the title *The Art of Christ* (B.O. & W.: 5s.). By the word "art" the Abbot means all that was distinctive of our Lord, in being and in action, His unique way of thinking and speaking and acting. To the end of His mortal life His disciples did not know Him adequately, and of many of His followers to-day it may be said—"Ye know not of what spirit you are." That Spirit now abides in the Church, His mystical Body, and the Abbot's thoughtful and inspiring pages will help us to discover and make it our own.

CHURCH HISTORY.

By publishing *The Ecclesiastical History* and the *Martyrs of Palestine* of Eusebius of Cæsarea (10s. 6d. n.), translated with Introduction and Notes by Hugh Jackson Lawlor, D.D., Litt.D., and John Ernest Leonard Oulton, B.D., the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has added an important member to its large list of valuable publications. The present first volume which contains the translation has nothing else of consequence, but the matter is well arranged and easy to follow; Eusebius' quotations, which are of course many and valuable, are in smaller print, headings are inserted which indicate the subject treated, and dates are added. Footnotes give the references for quotations, and occasionally, where translation is difficult, the Greek word or words of the original. In a word, the book is brought out with all the skill to which the S.P.C.K. has accustomed us. The translation itself, however, does not rouse our enthusiasm. In the main it is conscientious and faithful, but rather crabbed and pedantic. Why "dominical" oracles, for example, in III., 39. 1, in the title of Papias' work? "Oracles of the Lord" is plain good English, and much more intelligible. We might find fault, too, with "*did* not profit me" in III., 39. 4. Another important passage is missed when it is said that St. John "set forth the Gospel" in Ephesus (v. 8. 4), where "published his gospel" would convey the meaning beyond possibility of mistake. We have not found anything, however, that is seriously misleading, and the judgment to be passed upon the work as a whole must depend even more upon the notes than upon the translation.

SOCIOLOGY.

Morris's "News from Nowhere" and Bellamy's "Looking Backward"—not to say Blessed Thomas More's "Utopia"—are forms of literature which continue to be imitated, through a desire to set forth the logical development of current social and industrial principles through the palatable medium of a romance. Mr. Felix J. Blakemore, in *The Coming*

Hour (?) (Sands: 2s. 6d. n.), is the latest adventurer in this field, and he has shown considerable ingenuity in the construction of his story. His purpose is to show that, in spite of an immense development in everything that ministers to mechanical efficiency, the Socialist State some 30 years hence will be in a state of gradual decay, owing to the lack of motive for individual energy and initiative. Mr. Blakemore has not the imaginative genius of Mr. H. G. Wells and his machinery creaks somewhat, but his thought is clear and sound, based upon common sense and Christian principle, and the reader, who might find a purely economic treatise dry, will more easily assimilate right doctrine by means of this pleasantly-sugared pill.

No one could be better qualified than Canon Cronin, author of that standard Catholic work, "The Science of Ethics," to introduce young minds to the study of sociology, which is simply the application of ethics to the complicated problems of life in community. Hence the appearance of his **Primer of the Principles of Social Science** (Gill and Son: 2s.), intended for use in Irish secondary schools, may be reckoned an event of some importance for the future of Ireland. As we have often pointed out, the teaching of the Church contains the remedy for most social evils and the solution of most social problems, as far as such results can be achieved in a fallen world. And nowhere has the teaching of the Church a better chance of being accepted and acted on than in the traditional Catholicism of Ireland. But we trust the little book may come hither as well and help our Catholic scholars to understand aright the many, difficult questions of our time. It will find here Father H. Keane's "Primer of Moral Philosophy" (C.S.G.) already in partial possession, but there can be no question of rivalry between the books; rather they supplement one another as if designed to do so. Dr. Cronin's treatment of the constituents of Society is more detailed than Father Keane's, whereas the latter develops the foundations of right conduct more fully. Dr. Cronin presents his subject in catechetical form which makes it more easily digestible. His discussion is excellently suited to growing minds, and it will enable them to take an intelligent interest in, and form a sound judgment on, social, economic and political matters.

NON-CATHOLIC.

That an Anglican Bishop should sponsor Renan's atheistic story of our Lord's life, even though he characterizes it "as an exquisitely conceived and executed romance rather loosely or remotely based on history," may be classed as one of the most extraordinary manifestations of "free thought" in that extraordinary Church. It is true that Bishop Gore, in his introduction to this translation, **The Life of Jesus**, by Ernest Renan (Dent's Everyman's Library: 2s. n.), is at pains to point out Renan's deficiencies, both as a critic and as an historian, but that does not excuse his lending the prestige of his name to what every Christian should regard as an abominable piece of blasphemy, however "exquisitely conceived and executed." The same plea might excuse the editing of the worst works of Boccaccio or Rabelais. Not even the comforting account of the present state of rationalist criticism given by Dr. Gore—a matter of some indifference to those whose belief in the Gospels is based on divine authority—would justify anyone in purchasing, and so sharing in the evil done by, this attack on Christianity.

POETRY.

In the *Collected Poems of G. K. Chesterton* (B.O. & W.: 10s. 6d.) we have what many long have wished for,—a handy (though not too handy: the volume is massive like the author) means of access to the many brilliant things—lyrical, narrative, satirical, playful, pious—which they have glanced at in newspapers or little books of verse. To those who only know the vigorous journalist or the whimsical novelist or the weaver of paradoxes, this collection will be a revelation. For it contains the authentic matter of poetry—vision, elevation, an admirable sense of the colour and weight of words. Chesterton hymns the English of England—not the globe-trotting Imperialists of Kipling—and therefore he has room in his great heart for the patriotisms of other lands. Whether in long narrative or in lighter forms of verse, the eye of the seer and the hand of the craftsman are always blended, and the whole big volume is a delight—or a world of delights.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Sir James Marchant has made an excellent selection from the writings of that accomplished journalist who is also Dean of St. Paul's, under the title *Wit and Wisdom of Dean Inge* (Longmans: 3s. 6d. n.). That Dr. Inge can write with lucidity, point and, we may add, acerbity, is beyond question. But "Wit and Wisdom" is another matter. There is nothing incompatible in wit and a deanery, but whoever looks for the quality of a Mansel, to say nothing of a Swift, will be disappointed. We have dived repeatedly but have no store of very precious pearls. This is not to say that there is not much admirable writing and the evidence of a singularly alert and reflective mind. For Wisdom there is more of it than might be expected by a justly irritated reader of the *Evening Standard*, but the true is seldom new and the new is often questionable. We were happy to read again the Dean's charming description of his little daughter. In these simple, moving words of man and father, the bitter and rash controversialist is forgotten—*mentem mortalia tangunt*. There is little, we are glad to add, of Eugenics or Nordic nonsense. May we ask where one great Christian Church (the one Church is obviously intended) teaches that "the world with all it contains was made for man and that the lower orders of creation have *no claims whatever* upon us" (italics ours)? The Dean's modesty has moved him in a characteristic preface to eke out Sir James Marchant's choice with some specimens of Wit and Wisdom of his own gleaning. Among these is a dictum of Mr. G. M. Trevelyan in answer to a well-known gibe, "Voltaire, whatever he intended, never praised us better than when he said that we have a hundred religions." We must suppose that this is quoted with approval and we venture to suggest that "the worst educated people west of the Slav frontier" (the Dean's description of his countrymen, p. 87) has the religion it deserves.

MINOR PUBLICATIONS.

The Report of the Thirty-fifth Session of the Manchester Branch of the C.T.S. mentions a new and promising development of its work—the propaganda meetings organized by members of the Council during the

winter months throughout the various parishes of the diocese. Even such an obviously good work as that of the C.T.S. needs to be actively kept before the public if it is to find support, and Manchester has devised a means of doing so which may be even more productive than the usual sermon appeals. Just before the Session opened the Branch took a prominent part in organizing the National Congress. It is interesting to note that the Branch Membership, 2,745, greatly exceeds the total for the whole Society before the Forward Movement began.

A number of fresh reprints forms the main output of the C.T.S. this last month, including *The True History of Maria Monk*, now nearing its two-hundredth thousand; Father Woodlock's informative lecture, *The Church of England and "Reunion,"* showing, amongst other things, how hopeless the idea of corporate conversion is.

The C.T.S. of Ireland publish a life of *St. Gertrude* by W. H. Woolen, of *St. Vincent de Paul* by Rev. W. Hastings, C.M., and of *St. John of the Cross* by a Carmelite Father—all in twopenny pamphlets. *Living the Truth* by Judge O'Brien and *Faith and Reason* by Professor Howley are two addresses delivered at the Annual Meeting. In the smaller format, *His Slave*, by Mother St. Paul, is a series of short meditations on the *Sume et Suscipe*.

The interesting pamphlet by that veteran missionary, Father T. Van der Schueren, S.J., called *The Pontifical Society for the Propagation of the Faith*, is not a formal history of the Society but rather an informal chat, based on wide experience, about the methods by which its objects can be best attained. Several "speaking likenesses" of the author adorn its pages.

A new quarterly called *Carmelitana* will be devoted to the study of the mystical works of the Order. The first issue contains a critical discussion by P. Anastasius of St. Paul of a seventeenth century work—"Enucleatio Mysticæ Theologiæ S. Dionysii Areopagitæ."

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>BURNS, OATES & WASHBOURNE, London.</p> <p><i>The Folly of the Cross.</i> By R. Plus, S.J. Pp. xiv. 139. Price, 5s.</p> <p><i>The Philothea of the Devout Life.</i> By Allan Ross, Cong. Orat. Pp. 73. Price, 3s.</p> <p><i>The Ideal of the Fervent Soul.</i> By Auguste Saudreau. 2nd edit. Pp. xxx. 248. Price, 6s.</p> <p><i>The Art of Christ.</i> By Abbot Vonier, O.S.B. Pp. viii. 152. Price, 5s.</p> <p><i>Thoughts from St. Alphonsus.</i> Compiled by C. McNeiry, C.S.S.R. Pp. 142. Price, 2s. 6d. and 5s.</p> <p><i>The Book of the Beasts.</i> From the Catalan of Ramón Lull. By E. Allison Peers. Pp. ix. 90. Price, 3s. 6d.</p> | <p>C.T.S., London.</p> <p><i>Several new pamphlets and reprints.</i></p> <p>C.T.S. of Ireland.</p> <p><i>Several new pamphlets.</i></p> <p>CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS.</p> <p><i>An Introduction to Ecclesiastical Latin.</i> By H. P. V. Nunn. 2nd edit. Pp. xv. 162. Price, 6s. n.</p> <p>C. W. DANIEL COMPANY, London.</p> <p><i>Tramp Things.</i> By M. Michael. Pp. 64. Price, 2s. 6d. n.</p> <p>DENT & SONS, London.</p> <p><i>Later Greek Religion.</i> By Edwyn Bevan, D.Litt. Pp. xl. 234. Price, 5s. n.</p> <p><i>The Life of Jesus.</i> By E. Renan. Pp. xx. 244. Price, 2s.</p> |
|---|---|

HERDER, London.

Conferences on the Religious Life.

- By A. M. Skelly. O.P. Pp. viii. 271. Price, 9s. n. *Follow Me.* By P. Geiermann, C.S.S.R. Pp. vi. 225. Price, 7s. n. *Mary's Month.* By Sister M. Emmanuel, O.S.B. Pp. xiii. 229. Price, 7s. n. *Victims of Love.* Pp. xvii. 96. Price, 5s. n. *Comfort for the Sick.* By Clara M. Tiry. Pp. 350. Price, 9s. *Dies Irae.* From the German of Dr. H. Gühr. By Rev. J. Schmit. Pp. 184. Price, 6s. *Encyclicals of Pius XI.* Translated by Rev. James N. Ryan. Pp. xlvii. 248. Price, 9s. n. *Homiletic Thoughts.* From the German of Bishop Keppler. By Rev. H. Macdonald. Pp. vii. 128. Price, 5s. n. *The Epistle of Christ.* By Rev. M. A. Chapman. Pp. vii. 264. Price, 7s. n. *The Eucharistic Emmanuel.* By P. Geiermann, C.S.S.R. Pp. v. 151. Price, 6s. n. *Stock Charges against the Bible.* By C. Kean, O.F.M. Pp. vi. 140. Price, 5s. n. *A History of Philosophy.* By L. F. Miller, D.D. Pp. xiv. 352. Price, 12s. n. *Six World Problems.* By Rev. A. Power, S.J. Pp. vii. 127. Price, 5s. n. *Father Tim's Talks.* By F. McEnniry. Vol. VI. Pp. 192. Price, 5s. n.

HERDER, Freiburg.

- Geschichte der Papste.* XI. Pp. xl. 804. Price, 20 m.; XII. Pp. xxxvi. 698. Price, 20 m. *Psychologia Speculativa.* By Jos. Fröbes, S.J. Vol. I. Pp. viii. 254. Price, 5.50 m.

LAND AND NATION LEAGUE, London.

- The Farmer's Dilemma.* By Sir F. Acland. Pp. 24. Price, 6d.

LONGMANS, London.

- A Note on Religion.* By Sir H. Rider Haggard. Pp. 42. Price, 1s. n. *The Life of John Henry Newman.* By Wilfrid Ward. New Impression. Pp. 573. Price, 18s. n. *The Ethical Basis of Reality.* By Rev. E. E. Thomas. Pp. xiii. 262. Price, 10s. 6d. n. *The Mind.* Edited by R. J. S. McDowall. Pp. xvi. 316. Price, 8s. 6d. n. *A Seminary in the Making.* Compiled by Rev. Thomas Hooley. Pp. xii. 195. Price, 7s. 6d. n.

MARII & MARIETTI, Turin.

- D. T. Summa Theologica.* Pars. 3a, abridged. By P. John Lottini, O.P. Pp. 634. Price, 27 lire. *De Occasionalis et Recedivis.* By F. Ter Haar, C.S.S.R. Pp. xvi. 450. Price, 30 lire.

SANDS, London.

- The Price of Dawning Day.* By T. Gavan Duffy. Pp. 239. Price, 5s. n. *The Pilgrim's Guide to Franciscan Italy.* By P. F. Anson. Pp. xx. 243. Price, 6s. n. *The Seraph of Assisi.* By F. Alexander, O.F.M. Pp. 56. Price, 1s.

S.P.C.K., London.

- Early Christians of Rome.* By G. M. Bevan. Pp. x. 113. Price, 4s. n.

TALLERES TIPOGRAFICOS, Tarragona.

- La Lucha de los Católicos Mejicanos.* By a Friend of Mexico. Pp. 576. Price,

TEQUI, Paris.

- Guerisons de Lourdes en 1926.* By Dr. A. Vallet. Pp. xvi. 158. Price, 5.00 fr. *Several Saints' Lives.*

THE AMERICA PRESS, New York.

- In Towns and Little Towns.* By Leonard Feeney, S.J. Pp. viii. 108.

i.
e,
y
d.
e,
o/
s.
n.
S.
e,
s
v.
5.

a,
il,
e.
s.
p.

y
e,
to
r.
s.
y
5.

y
3.
i-
o.

y
3.
s'

y
i.